DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 062 231 SO 002 749

AUTHOR	McGee, Reece; Knuckman, Charlene S.
TITLE	The Graduate Teaching Assistant: Effects on Students in Large Undergraduate Courses. Purdue Experiment in Mass Instruction.
INSTITUTION	Purdue Univ., Lafayette, Ind. Dept. of Sociology.
REPORT NO	BULL-4
PUB DATE	69
NOTE	52p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Classroom Research; *College Instruction; Higher Education; *Large Group Instruction; Lecture; Sociology; *Teaching Assistants; Teaching Methods; *Teaching Quality

ABSTRACT

An Introductory Sociology class enrolling up to 1,000 students per semester was the group used in this experiment to discover empirically validated means of teaching the mass class with both emotional satisfaction to students and pedagogical efficiency. The course was conducted in lecture-discussion style with two lectures and one discussion meeting per week. Eleven teaching assistants were responsible for four sections of eighteen students each. The goal of the teaching program was to teach students to think analytically using sociological concepts. Student achievement was based on essay papers. Four semesters of data are presented in 20 tables in this report. Tentative conclusions were: many common beliefs about the influence of the graduate teaching assistant are not supported by the report data; what does happen in the TA's classroom appears not unlike what can be expected to happen in any classroom, regardless of the professional status of the teacher; we know little about the ways in which the manifold influences to which students are subjected in the college classroom act upon them to produce the results we see. (Author/VW)

ED 062231

SO

THE GRADUATE TEACHING ASSISTANT: EFFECTS ON STUDENTS IN LARGE UNDERGRADUATE COURSES

by

Reece McGee

and

Charlene S. Knuckman

Institute for the Study of Social Change
Department of Sociology
Purdue University

SP002 749

Purdue Experiment in Mass Instruction
Bulletin Number 4

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

(1) See Butler Crittenden and Reece McGee, AN EXPERIMENT IN MASS INSTRUCTION, Purdue Experiment in Mass Instruction, Bulletin # 1.

(2) Of those background variables which "obviously" might have such an effect, only religion of student is not investigated here as previous research had rather strongly suggested that, except in extraordinary cases, it has no effect on student experience of the course. See Lu Ann Aday, THE RELATION BETWEEN PARTICIPATION IN CHURCH FUNCTIONS AND PARTICIPATION IN VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATIONAL ACTIVITY, unpublished M.S. thesis, Department of Sociology, Purdue University, 1969.

(3) Charlene S. Knuckman, A CONTINUING EXPERIMENT IN MASS EDUCATION, Purdue Experiment in Mass Instruction, Bulletin # 3.

The Purdue Experiment in Mass Instruction is an activity of the Department of Sociology, Purdue University, and is directed by Reece McGee, Professor of Sociology, Purdue Master Teacher. Reprints of this or other Experiment Bulletins may be secured from the Institute for the Study of Social Change, Department of Sociology, Purdue University. Inquiries concerning the Experiment in Mass Instruction should be directed to Professor McGee.

THE GRADUATE TEACHING ASSISTANT: EFFECTS ON STUDENTS IN LARGE UNDERGRADUATE COURSES

The role of the graduate teaching assistant and his effect in the classroom--particularly under conditions of relative independence--has long been a matter of concern to departments employing large numbers of graduate students in teaching capacities. Questions as to the quality of instruction offered by graduate assistants, similarity of behavior in multi-section courses, comparability of instruction with that offered by teachers of professorial status, etc., have all been common for years. More recently, in response to unrest among university students, often incited or led by graduate assistants, questions have been raised concerning graduate student political activity and inclination and their effects--or those of deliberate indoctrination in the classroom--on students and teaching programs. Perhaps a corollary of the later concern is the notion often expressed on the part of undergraduate students that they must concur with "T.A. bias" in order to secure satisfactory grades from their graduate student mentors. (In introductory sociology, for example, that they must express liberal attitudes on the topic of race.)

The purpose of this paper is to begin to explore empirically the effect of the graduate teaching assistant upon students in the university classroom. We recognize at the outset, of course, that the rigid controls over all relevant aspects of the experimental situation demanded by

scientific precision can never be met in any actual teaching millieu remotely resembling "the normal classroom," perhaps particularly not when, as in our case, the class is one conducted on a mass scale. We believe, nonetheless, that relatively reliable information can be derived to advance our knowledge of the problem area.

The data presented here are a product of the Purdue Experiment in Mass Instruction. This has been described in detail in earlier reports[1] but can be summarized as follows. The Experiment is an on-going effort of the Department of Sociology at Purdue University which utilizes the very large (up to 1,000 students per semester) Introductory Sociology class as an experimental group on which to test various teaching devices. The goal of the experiment is the discovery of empirically validated means of teaching the more and more common mass class with both emotional satisfaction to students and pedagogical efficiency. To this end students in the course are required to complete a personal history questionnaire at the beginning of each term and a major course evaluation at the end. Both contain personality scale items, a before-and-after "general sociology information" test, etc. Additional information such as S.A.T. scores, attendance records, etc., is also collected.

During the four semesters in which the data presented here were gathered, teaching in the course was conducted in lecture-discussion style with two lectures and one discussion meeting per week. The course coordinator, a senior faculty member, was responsible for lecture while discussion sections were met by eleven or twelve teaching assistants each responsible for four sections of about eighteen students each. The goal of the

teaching program at this time was to teach students to think analytically using sociological concepts rather than necessarily mastering facts or data. Consequently conventional examinations and term papers were discarded in favor of evaluation based on essay papers ("think pieces") the number of which changed during the semesters reported here from eleven to nine to four with corresponding increases in length of from two to five or six typewritten pages. Records of attendance in lecture and discussion were kept (although attendance was not required) and grades were based solely on papers and brief reading quizes.

Some attempt was made during all four semesters to maintain teaching assistant comparability in grading and classroom performance. For the first three terms reported here (where students wrote eleven, nine and nine papers, respectively), topics for papers were invented by the course staff and their focus and scope agreed upon. In addition, ten percent of each T.A.'s papers (T.A.'s assigned grades in the course) were traded every assignment for grading by another tutor and by the course coordinator and his administrative assistant. Grades assigned to individual papers by these three other persons were reported back to the original grader although he was not required to abide by their opinions. This system, while compulsory only in requiring the distribution and extra marking of ten percent of all papers received, did result in a considerable reduction in variation in grades awarded by different teaching assistants. It was abandoned in the latter semester reported here as a result of the reduction in the number of papers required and the greater consequential T.A. autonomy. Some comparability was still attempted, however, through

collective discussion of assignments and their aims and focus. Final grades were also controlled to some extent through dictation by the course coordinator of the proportions of each letter grade to be awarded to the class as a whole although no student had an earned average reduced by this method of "curving." (Which was not applied rigorously to grades awarded by individual teaching assistants; thus an excess of "A's" among the students of one T.A. might be "made up for" by an excess of "D" or "F" grades among the students of another although T.A.'s were urged to conform as much as possible to "curve" guidelines.)

Data reported here consist of information obtained from questionnaires administered to all students in the course in each of the semesters studied (N=3358). They involve eleven "evaluation items"--student ratings of different aspects of the course, one "performance variable"--final grade in the course, and six "background variables"--student characteristics as self-reported on the personal history form. Most evaluation items and two background variables (political position and social class position) were reported on five-place scales. Several background variables are reported, first as cross-tabulated by evaluation items and then as controlled for one or more other background items, in each case as parcelled out (controlled for) tutor. In this way the effects of individual tutors (T.A.'s) and variations in results resulting from introductions of that control can be seen as separated from variations attributable to other variables. Specific control variables (or background characteristics) were selected by "face logic": that it was reasonable to hypothesize that sex, rural-urban origin, etc., might well affect response to and performance in the course.[2] The

tables are offered only as exemplary of the kinds of teaching assistant influence our data demonstrate and do not attempt to reveal all possible cross-tabulations for each variable. Preliminary analyses[3] had shown relatively little general relation between structural course variables and student evaluation of the course. When gamma matrices were constructed describing the association between student course evaluations and student background characteristics with controls for graduate assistants added, however, variation increased notably suggesting that teaching assistants have a demonstrable effect on student reactions, even under the rather circumscribed conditions reported here, but do not in any sense determine them. Students apparently remain capable of maintaining objectivity in course evaluation and much of the influence which the graduate assistant is seen to have must be regarded, at this point, at least, as inexplicable. Specific analyses follow.

Rural-Urban Origins

Table 1 shows the cross-tabulation of students' origins by their evaluation of the course controlled for semesters in college. In general, all associations (gamma) are low with no particular variation associated with maturation as defined by the semester measure. There appears to be no meaningful relation between either origins or semesters in college and performance in the course as measured by final grade. The directions of the associations are consistent from semester to semester and variations in course structure do not seem to have affected them. Table 2, which controls for individual teaching assistants, shows gamma associations somewhat greater indicating that tutors had more important influences over

student's evaluations than did simple length of matriculation in college. The greater variation in association for most evaluation items, however, may be interpreted as indicating that whatever influence tutors had was more widely variable. Some teaching assistants do seem to influence their students as related to those student's origins, others do not. This interpretation is supported by the fact that variation seems to increase in later semesters where tutor autonomy was also greater. Table 3, which controls for sex of student, shows the greatest variation in associations yet seen both within and among students of either sex and between sexes. Men and women appear to react differently to different evaluation items (as shown by differences in direction of the association indicated by sign). This variation is increased notably by controlling for tutor, Table 4. We conclude, in general, from Tables 1-4 that when origins are considered, the impact of teaching assistants upon students is more greatly related to the sex of the student than to either the student's experience of college or the tutor's personal characteristics. The variation, however, seems to be related more closely to the control for tutors than sex of students, that is, more variation is introduced by controlling the data for tutors than for sex of student.

Recent years have seen an increase in the "politicalization" of the university and in charges that teaching personnel--perhaps graduate teaching assistants in particular--have used the classroom as a "soapbox" from which to voice individualistic political and social opinion. Sociology, especially, has been subjected to such charges. In a program such as that described here, such issues are obviously important ones and such behavior,

if present, might well influence student reactions to the graduate assistant and to the course. Equally, if the course were itself politically "loaded," students' political attitudes would also be salient to their reactions to it. Our data provide some insight into these matters.

Table 5 presents a composite picture of the association between political beliefs of students and their evaluation of the course. Considerable consistency is manifested over time. While the range for all scores is $\pm$ .18, more than 80% fall within the $\pm$ .10 range. Directions of associations remain relatively similar for all semesters reported. In general those defining themselves as more liberal are slightly more likely to report approval of the course, the lecture and the teaching assistant, slightly less likely to find grading harsh or unfair and, for three of the four semesters, are slightly more likely to receive higher grades. The self-defined more conservative are slightly more likely to prefer the more normal system of examinations and term papers to that used in the course, to attend lecture more frequently, and to blame the course structure if performance is inadequate. In general, then, the course as presently structured appeals somewhat more highly to students who define themselves as liberal rather than conservative.

When these same relationships are controlled for number of semesters of college matriculation, (Table 6), patterns of some interest begin to emerge. For the most part, for those who are in their first semester of college, associations remain relatively low with variable directionality. For more advanced students, the political position of the rating students seems to be most important for those in their second semester of college and this relation holds true for all four semesters studied. Student's political beliefs,

thus, seem to structure ratings most highly during the latter half of the freshman year. The general picture presented by Table 6 is that increasing experience of college increases both the range and amount of variation in response to the course when such responses are controlled for students' political beliefs. In general political position does not seem to be much related to course evaluation but whatever relation does exist may be a function of lack of college experience.

Table 7 shows student course evaluations as influenced by political position when controlled for tutor. The use of this control introduces substantial variation in ratings. It appears that in earlier semesters of the course where tutor performance was rigidly controlled, the general response to tutors was unaffected by student's political position. When TAs were given greater latitude (last semester reported), a relation appears between students' political positions and tutor evaluations with more liberal students prefering both their tutors and the system of instruction somewhat more than more conservative students.

We do not possess empirical measures of tutor's political attitudes. Most, certainly, were more or less typical of sociology graduate students everywhere, tending toward the liberal end of the political spectrum although not more than two or three of those reported here are known to have styled themselves "radical." Either as assessed informally or by self-report, however, individual tutor's political beliefs cannot be shown by these data to affect student evaluation of the course. Variations in ratings do not appear to be consistently associated with either "more liberal" or "more conservative" tutors. This is an important conclusion even though the evidence supporting it is "soft."

It is also important to note that while student assessment of both "hardness" and "fairness" of grading does vary widely according to tutor when controlled for student's political position, (and the variation increases during the last semester when there was greater TA autonomy), the variation in actual grades given to students is small and the relation between grades given and student political position is low. The graduate assistant, then, is capable of maintaining grading objectivity despite student political beliefs which may differ from his own. This, too, is an important finding because it contradicts so much undergraduate mythology concerning the necessity of "telling the TA what he wants to hear."

Table 8 shows student evaluations and performance by political position as controlled for sex. In general the introduction of the control for sex does not discriminate: men and women tend to rate similarly, relations are low and variation is small. What variation does occur does not appear to be consistent either as regards sex or political position and the total range of variation for all four semesters and both sexes is only from -.14 to + .20. Sex, then, does not appear to have any significant effect on ratings already controlled for political position.

Table 9 cross-tabulates student course evaluations and political positions as controlled for sex and tutor and again, as in previous displays, the introduction of the control for individual tutors shows significant increases in both magnitude and variation among gamma scores. Student political position is related to reaction to the course as influenced both by their tutors and their own sexes. Sex appears to be an influential variable when the tutor control is added. In what appears to be the typical instance, when a very

high association is reported for a particular evaluation or performance variable for a tutor's students of one sex, the magnitude of the same relation for his students of the other sex will be low. Directionality varies, indicating that the influence of political position is inconsistent. Both magnitudes and directions of relationships vary for a given tutor over time indicating that the relations among the variables, whatever they are, are not the product of tutor sex bias (which could be expected to be consistent).

It has long been recognized that, like sex, social class position often plays a significant role in individual reactions to specific situations. Exploring this variable in the data, we find this expectation apparently supported. Social class of student, (as measured by the Hollingshead scale), seems to have some influence on general reaction to the course of instruction. The cross-tabulation of social class position by evaluation and performance items (Table 10) appears to show little variation. All associations range around zero with little consistent pattern. With the exception of four evaluation measures, even direction of association is not consistent over time. Those that are consistent in direction may be interpreted as reflecting expectable class biases: the higher the social class of the student, the more likely he is to respond favorably to lecture, to prefer essay measurement over conventional testing, to like the course in general and to receive high grades. These relationships are all very slight but would demonstrate consistencies due to social class standing.

Table 11 presents the relationship above (social class of student by evaluation of course) controlled for sex of student. For most variables there is very little difference between the degree of association for males

and that for females. The consistency in direction for the four items mentioned above is for the most part maintained. This table may be read to suggest that even controlling for sex, social class seems to play a small part in influencing response to the course. In Table 12, however, the control for individual tutor is once again introduced with the result that the directional consistency of the four evaluation items disappears while variability among associations increases. This would seem to indicate that tutor behavior may tap class-based reactions in students which are submerged or suppressed until controls for individual tutors are introduced into the data.

When these relationships are further controlled for sex of student as well as for tutor, (Table 13) the associations between social class and response to the course becomes even stronger and more variable. For most of the TAs the influence of students' social class is clearly confounded with sex of student. Thus the relation between an evaluation measure and social class may be very high positive for a particular tutor's students of a given sex and low or negative for his students of the other sex. There appears, further, to be little or no consistency for any item. We must conclude on the basis of these data, therefore, that while social class seems to play a rather important role in determining reaction to the course when filtered through a particular graduate assistant and controlled for sex of student, that role is an interactive one which cannot be discerned without controlling for those variables. Massing the data without such controls actually masks or suppresses the influence of the class variable.

It has been apparent throughout these data that the influence of student's sex is sometimes important in determining direction or magnitude

of associations between student reactions and other variables or for the assessment of the influence of other items. There has also been some suggestion in previous tables that the significance of this factor may be influenced by student sophistication or maturity as measured by number of semesters of college experience. Table 14 explores the relation between sex and evaluation items. Again there is little consistency. Variability of gamma is small with a range of no more than .18 on any variable throughout the four semesters on which data is presented. Consistency of direction is maintained on only two variables, preference for essays (males slightly more likely to prefer essay system of grade assignment) and blame for inadequate performance (males slightly more likely to blame course structure). As an independent variable, then, sex does not appear to account for student reaction to the course. When these same relationships are controlled for semesters of college experience, however, (Table 15), sex becomes more strongly associated with evaluation items. Number of semesters of college experience does appear to make some difference in how students react to the course although there is little consistency in the direction of the associations, suggesting that other variables may be operating to "scramble" any sexual consistency present.

Previous tables have suggested that the control for the specific graduate assistant is necessary one since the student's experience of the course is funnelled through an interaction with a teaching assistant. Table 16 shows sex of student by number of semesters in college according to student reaction with the control for tutor added. The hypothesis that response by sex is influenced by TA is only partially supported as regards college experience;

variation among gamma values is relatively high and again there is little consistency in directionality, (i.e., whether the course appeals primarily to males or females). On a few items there does appear to be a generally consistent direction: on the whole, women are more likely to receive higher grades, men more likely to prefer the essay system and to perceive grading in the course as hard. The data do not support the hypothesis that sex of student and TA interact in any predictable manner although among the tutors represented for more than one semester, at least two do seem to elicit similar responses, e.g.,

Tutor Robert A.

Spring	1969	-.10	-.23	-.06	-.39	.17	.02	-.35	.25	.46	.44	.07	-.48	.21	-.39	.28
Fall	1969	.18	-.43	-.34	-.16	.25	.07	-.13	.17	-.07	-.20	-.07	-.37	.21	-.40	.35

Tutor Janet

Spring	1969	.05	.01	-.07	.17	-.13	.35	-.34	.13	.01	-.20	-.12	.47	.11	-.17	-.01
Fall	1969	.03	-.23	-.19	.00	-.05	-.03	-.30	.26	.39	.32	-.09	-.21	.08	-.00	.38

Other TAs present for more than one semester receive responses which differ somewhat from semester to semester.

The data are thus subject to a somewhat tenative conclusion: given the increased strength and variability of responses shown when controls for teaching assistants are added, (over response to evaluation items uncontrolled for tutor), it is possible to suggest that there is some effect as a result of the interaction between student's sex and the particular TA. However, because this interaction appears to be inconsistent both between and among TAs, perhaps due to the intervention of other variables, it is unpredictable from these data.

Semesters of College Experience

Table 17 shows the association between numbers of semesters of college experience and course evaluation for the four terms here surveyed. In general, the relationships appear quite low, ranging around zero, and fairly consistent from term to term for specific items. Except in the first term studied, performance (as measured by final grade) seems to have little relation to duration of college experience.

Table 18 shows the same relationships, this time as controlled for sex of student. The addition of the control variable appears to have little effect upon the association of the other variables: values remain low and range about zero. Introduction of the control on sex does reveal some minor sex differences in response among students not all of which are consistent, even in direction, from term to term. Magnitudes of associations appear generally consistent over time.

Table 19 relates numbers of semesters of college experience to evaluation items as controlled for individual tutors. Variations are notably greater with many cells departing from zero by substantial degrees. The length of the student's college experience, then when ordered by teaching assistant, produces greater associations with evaluation items. Gamma as high as .60 and .67 are seen in one case (Spring 1968) for associations with grade indicating, perhaps tutor reward for maturity of understanding in grading written work. In other cases the association with grade is zero. Magnitudes of association are not consistent among tutors nor for individual tutors over time. Results from one individual over three consecutive semesters are shown below for illustrative purposes.

Tutor Robert M.

Fall	1968	-.23	.24	-.05	-.20	.03	.01	.08	.12	-.31	.17	-.18	-.12
Spring	1969	-.04	.08	.05	-.24	-.04	.00	-.44	-.59	.53	.20	-.06	-.20
Fall	1969	.13	.36	.26	-.02	-.05	.55	-.11	-.27	.36	.10	.18	.08

As can be seen, some of these results are generally consistent in magnitude but vary in direction over time while for others the reverse tends to be true. No consistent patterns appear for any tutor. It is possible, therefore, to draw the very general conclusion that the tutor has more influence on course evaluation than does experience in college but that the degree and direction of such influence -- even for individual teaching assistants -- must be a function of interactions with particular groups of students or of other matters and are, therefore, unpredictable.

Table 20 shows the same cross-tabulations with the further control for sex of student added. The magnitudes of differences in the associations shown increase even more as a result of this control so that we may again conclude that the TA's influence on course evaluation is importantly affected by the sex of the rating student. In some cases, as shown in the abstracted results from one tutor shown below for illustrative purposes, directions of association remain consistent over time suggesting some consistent sex effects, perhaps as a result of the sex or other attribute of the tutor. In other cases this is not true. For the tutor shown, for example, (a female), associations of ratings from male students (overall course rating - boxed) are consistent i.e., as college experience increases, males are more likely to like the course, and are of substantial magnitude. For female students of the same tutor these ratings are lower in magnitude and shift direction over time.

Tutor Janet

Spring 1968	.36	.29	.42	.23	-.08	.15	-.19	-.46	-.02	.08	.14	.54
Fall 1968	.88	-.42	-.64	.50	.39	-.90	.35	-.52	.55	.72	-.45	.00
Spring 1969	.43	-.40	-.35	1.00	.11	-.32	.17	-.37	.70	.15	-.01	.45
Spring 1968	-.27	.28	.06	.32	.23	-.11	-.27	.13	-.13	.24	.25	.06
Fall 1968	-.01	-.25	-.13	-.11	.33	-.45	-.19	.00	.33	.50	-.12	.35
Spring 1969	.10	-.53	-.45	.06	.02	-.17	-.05	-.13	.18	-.01	-.13	-.10

Our general conclusion from this group of matrices is that experience in college as expressed by number of semesters of enrollment is not importantly related to students' evaluation of the course but that such interrelations are significantly affected by individual teaching assistants, perhaps as a function of the graduate student's sex status in interaction with sex of student. Such effects appear unpredictable, however, and may be capricious even for individual assistants.

Summary

The purpose of this paper was to attempt an empirical assessment of the influence in the classroom of the graduate teaching assistant. Much has been said about the effects TAs have on students and even more is believed about it by faculty and undergraduates alike. Some of these beliefs, indeed, approach the status of myth, i.e., that TAs use their classrooms as vehicles for political indoctrination and that students must agree with TA biases or else be punished by reduced grades. While the data presented here are not generalizable beyond the large experimental class in which they were gathered, and while their interpretation is not always clear, some conclusions concerning the role of the graduate assistant in this course during the periods to which these data refer seem justifiable.

In general it seems fair to say that specific "background variables" such as sex, social or political position, etc., do not seem to much affect student reaction to and performance in the course in question, when considered as independent variables. When used as dependent variables in conjunction with a similar measure acting as independent, greater variation in and magnitudes of relationship are usually introduced, although these are likely still to remain relatively low. As a general principal, relations between student characteristics and evaluation or performance in the course are found to be greatest when controls for individual tutors are applied although both the directions of such relations and their consistency over time are typically highly variable. We conclude, then, that the graduate assistant who is in charge of a discussion section in a course such as this does exercise an important (although hardly determinative) influence over student reactions

to (and presumably experience of) the course. That influence is a complicated interaction effect, however, the influences of the student's sex, political or class standing, etc., interacting with some characteristics of the tutor produce the relationships shown here for particular students and these are the consequences of individual factors in most cases since the same tutors do not consistently produce similar reactions in the same kinds of students either in direction or magnitude. It is also important to note that variations in these relationships seem to be increased by greater teaching assistant autonomy in the classroom and decreased by reduced TA autonomy.

Finally, some popular myths appear to be contradicted by these data: "liberal" students perform only slightly better in the course than self-defined "conservatives" and the latter approve of the course only slightly less; by themselves the political positions or attitudes of graduate assistants do not appear to affect either their assessments of their students or student assessment of them or the course; social class of students alone seems to have little apparent relation to student performance in or rating of the course although some slight associations in expected directions appear; sex biases on the part of either tutors or students do not appear to influence the data; experience in college may be highly related to performance in the course (as measured by final grade received) but only for the students of certain graduate assistants, and even this relation is deeply confounded by the sex of the student.

We conclude, then, that in a sense we know less than we did before. The influence of the graduate assistant upon the student in the mass course is important but far from simple; it is highly variable, even for individual

assistants, and shows little consistency over time. It is, apparently, a function of the interaction of the individual TA with the particular student or class and, at least so far as these data are concerned, no predictions about it are possible. Three important conclusions can be tentatively drawn, however: (1) many common beliefs about the influence of the graduate teaching assistant are not supported by these data; (2) what does happen in the TA's classroom appears not unlike what can be expected to happen in any classroom, regardless of the professional status of the teacher: individuals collide intellectually and emotionally and the greater the variation permitted the teacher, the more various the results upon his students; (2) we do not know very much really, about what actually happens in the college classroom, about how our students react to us or why, or the ways in which the manifold influences to which they are subjected act upon them to produce the results we see.

NOTE TO THE READER: In the following tables, all columns are numbered to facilitate spacing on the page. The column numbers in all tables correspond to the following headings for each column.

(1) Overall Evaluation of Lecture: 1 - above average; 5 - below average.

(2) Overall Evaluation of Tutorial System of Teaching: 1 - of great value; 5 - of no value.

(3) Evaluation of Assigned Teaching Assistant: 1 - of great aid; 5 - of no aid.

(4) Preference for Essay System of Grading: 1 - strongly prefer essay system; 5 - strongly prefer conventional exams.

(5) Severity of Grading: 1 - grading perceived as harsh; 5 - grading perceived as easy, "a snap".

(6) Fairness of Grading: 1 - grading perceived as more fair than most; 3 - less fair than most.

(7) Adequacy of Essay System as a Measure of Performance: 1 - not a good measure; 3 - a good measure.

(8) Overall Evaluation of All Aspects of Course: 1 - far below average; 5 - well above average.

(9) Regularity of Attendance at Lecture: 1 - rarely missed lecture; 5 - rarely attended.

(10) Source Blamed for Inadequate Performance: 1 - lecturer; 2 - teaching assistant; 3 - self; 4 - no one.

(11) Evaluation of Teaching Assistant's Class Preparation: 1 - very well organized; 5 - very disorganized.

(12) Final Grade in Course: 2 - failing; 6 - "A".

(13) Social Class Standing as Measured by Hollingshead Two Factor Index: 1 - high social class; 5 - low social class.

Coding of Other Variables

Sex: 1 - male; 2 - female.

Rural-Urban Origins: 1 - resides on farm; 7 - resides in megalopolis.

Semesters in College: 1 - in first semester of college; 4 - in fourth semester or more.

Self-Defined Political Position: 1 - very conservative; 5 - radical.

Table 1

Rural-Urban Origins by Course Evaluation
Controlled for Number of Semesters in College
(gamma)

Semesters of College	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
						Spring 1968							
1	-.00	-.16	-.07	-.05	.07	-.12	.04	.11	.17	.05	-.14	.16	-.24
2	-.08	-.10	-.10	-.08	.00	-.00	.14	.13	.10	.11	-.05	.17	-.20
3 or more	-.11	.01	-.00	-.03	-.13	-.01	.01	.07	.07	-.04	.01	.12	-.05
						Fall 1968							
1	-.00	-.05	-.09	-.04	.04	-.07	.01	.09	.04	.08	-.02	.08	-.16
2	-.09	-.03	-.03	-.11	-.14	-.01	.02	.14	-.19	.13	.09	.16	-.15
3 or more	-.12	-.07	-.11	-.03	.01	-.12	-.02	.14	.11	-.09	-.01	.08	-.16
						Spring 1969							
1	.04	-.09	-.08	-.10	-.03	-.16	-.03	.11	.32	.03	-.07	.03	-.17
2	-.06	-.07	-.08	-.08	.04	-.06	.07	.11	.14	.05	-.07	.01	-.27
3 or more	-.08	-.14	-.18	-.15	.18	-.14	.06	.21	.01	.11	-.15	.12	-.20
						Fall 1969							
1	-.12	-.02	-.01	-.02	.10	-.16	.17	.17	-.00	.10	-.03	.18	-.29
2	-.10	.12	.09	.03	-.04	.05	-.18	-.07	.02	-.15	.08	.10	-.02
3 or more	-.09	.01	-.06	.04	-.06	.02	.01	.14	.01	.11	-.03	.09	-.16

Table 2

Rural-Urban Origins by Course
Evaluation Controlled for Tutor
(gamma)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
						Spring 1968							
Adrian	.04	.14	.16	-.12	-.15	-.07	.01	.10	.04	-.09	.09	.15	-.07
Samuel	-.49	-.05	.04	-.32	-.01	.17	.05	.20	.04	.08	.07	.04	-.01
Gerhard	-.07	-.18	-.18	.18	.04	-.24	.16	.19	-.05	.07	.04	.16	-.10
Charlotte	-.08	.04	-.06	-.00	.14	.08	.17	-.10	-.09	-.03	-.03	.12	-.07
Arthur	-.01	-.08	-.21	-.00	-.16	-.02	.03	.12	.12	-.21	-.19	-.00	-.05
William	-.05	.05	.12	-.00	.16	-.16	.02	.03	.25	.10	.00	-.05	-.11
Roberta	-.19	-.09	.01	.02	.20	-.26	.12	.20	-.27	.38	-.18	.00	-.06
Paula	-.11	.17	-.05	-.04	-.26	.00	.15	.14	-.04	.25	-.00	.27	-.07
Linda	-.20	-.05	.11	-.24	.26	-.20	.32	.21	-.04	.02	.01	.21	-.26
James	.06	-.22	-.11	-.11	-.16	.23	.05	.12	.01	.12	-.11	.09	-.01
						Fall 1968							
Delores	-.09	-.14	-.31	.07	-.09	.01	-.05	.06	.10	-.07	-.08	.12	-.32
Adrian	-.03	.03	-.09	-.10	.08	.04	-.05	.21	.06	.17	-.00	-.04	-.21
Lee	-.21	-.00	-.05	-.11	.08	-.16	-.07	.11	.21	.22	-.00	.33	-.30
Pamela	-.16	-.17	-.15	-.10	.14	-.25	.08	.21	.24	.05	-.18	.18	.00
Robert A.	-.13	-.05	-.02	-.13	-.25	-.06	.19	.02	.08	-.06	.18	.02	-.15
Gerhard	-.16	-.14	-.13	-.18	-.02	-.05	-.06	.16	.16	-.13	-.09	.01	-.09
Arthur	.03	-.01	-.27	-.31	-.19	.08	-.05	.27	.07	-.00	-.07	.19	-.33
Michael	-.09	-.09	.01	.00	.07	-.09	.04	.01	-.01	-.12	.26	.02	-.00
Robert M.	-.12	-.03	-.07	-.03	-.05	-.02	-.09	.10	.33	-.00	-.10	-.06	-.08
Harvey	-.09	.07	-.05	.08	.00	.07	-.14	-.05	-.10	.17	-.00	-.06	-.22
Janet	-.14	.12	.09	-.09	.23	-.11	.01	.12	.08	.07	-.02	-.01	-.13

Table 2 (con't)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
						Spring 1969							
Delores	.21	-.22	-.27	-.12	-.03	-.09	-.09	-.13	-.10	.01	-.01	.18	-.05
Lee	-.04	-.38	-.22	.09	-.10	-.05	-.01	.03	.31	.22	-.06	-.24	-.10
Pamela	-.13	-.23	-.25	-.23	-.26	.02	-.18	.25	.05	-.22	-.12	.18	-.18
Robert A.	-.28	-.21	-.28	-.20	.10	-.32	-.07	.28	-.24	.12	-.04	-.08	-.46
Jacqulyn	.19	-.03	-.09	.09	.22	-.13	-.12	-.10	.14	.11	.00	-.06	.15
Arthur	.18	.01	-.14	-.02	.00	-.07	-.13	.03	-.07	-.03	-.04	.06	.00
Michael	.04	-.24	.01	-.15	.27	-.05	.24	.43	.20	-.09	-.26	-.06	-.40
Robert M.	.06	.23	-.11	.14	-.02	.32	-.13	.23	-.40	-.05	.07	.18	.02
Harvey	-.12	-.03	-.01	-.30	.32	-.10	.10	.15	-.26	.12	-.32	.29	-.21
Janet	-.08	-.31	-.23	.11	.07	-.04	.12	.34	.26	-.20	-.26	.26	-.05
Deena	-.08	.11	-.12	-.02	-.07	-.02	.06	.09	.17	-.40	-.05	.01	-.29
						Fall 1969							
LuAnn	-.14	-.11	-.13	-.12	.31	.05	.01	.34	.14	.01	-.09	.28	-.04
Severine	-.10	.13	.12	-.18	-.22	-.00	.09	.04	-.00	.26	-.10	.15	-.31
Jack	-.12	.09	.00	-.09	.19	-.26	.03	.15	-.17	.04	.03	.19	-.23
Robert A.	.07	-.05	.02	-.00	-.04	-.22	.15	.14	-.29	.18	-.10	.05	-.04
Leslie	-.17	.01	.10	-.07	.29	-.28	.11	.08	-.17	.22	-.05	.23	-.22
Kay	.05	.18	.11	.09	-.02	-.02	.14	.24	-.16	-.11	.08	.08	-.31
Violet	-.02	-.14	-.34	-.01	-.05	.09	.25	.03	.26	-.10	-.18	.08	-.23
Anthony	-.15	.16	.20	.00	-.23	-.34	.18	.14	.05	.04	.06	.19	-.34
Andrew	-.09	.17	-.03	.09	-.00	-.11	-.24	.02	-.09	.01	.18	-.06	-.11
Antonia	-.19	-.04	-.11	-.24	.35	-.20	.27	.33	.25	.11	.03	-.04	-.29
Robert M.	-.23	-.23	-.20	.08	.09	.05	-.08	.25	-.13	.20	-.15	.09	-.40
Janet	.01	.11	.01	.10	-.08	-.05	.09	.06	.32	.03	-.08	-.07	.05

Table 3

Rural-Urban Origins by Course Evaluation Controlled for Sex (gamma)

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Spring 1968	Males	.11	-.04	-.04	-.14	.03	-.04	.18	.16	.10	.03	-.03	.17
	Females	-.07	-.08	-.04	-.00	-.13	.00	-.01	.04	.11	.00	-.03	.10
Fall 1968	Males	-.07	-.06	-.06	-.15	-.06	-.06	.04	.12	.11	-.01	.01	.10
	Females	-.08	-.06	-.12	-.01	.00	-.12	-.01	.13	.04	.04	-.02	.19
Spring 1969	Males	-.08	-.04	-.17	-.08	.10	-.08	.02	.14	.19	.04	-.11	.02
	Females	-.01	-.18	-.08	-.17	.04	-.13	.06	.17	.00	.10	-.09	.10
Fall 1969	Males	-.07	-.00	-.02	-.04	.11	-.06	.06	.14	-.01	.10	.03	.05
	Females	-.13	-.01	-.02	.02	.01	-.10	.10	.15	.01	.10	-.04	.20

Table 4

Rural-Urban Origins by Course Evaluation
Controlled for Tutor and Sex of Student
(gamma)

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
							Spring 1968							
Adrian	Male	.11	-.18	.05	-.14	.02	-.08	.18	.17	.10	-.13	-.01	.17	-.18
	Female	.07	.29	.13	.02	-.17	.01	-.00	-.07	.00	-.12	.08	.20	-.10
Samuel	Male	-.41	-.15	-.01	-.53	.02	.04	.29	.33	.04	.28	.01	.28	.09
	Female	-.27	-.00	-.08	-.20	.01	.04	-.19	.12	.45	-.04	-.04	-.01	-.45
Gerhard	Male	-.05	-.26	-.38	.04	.03	.07	.17	.27	.20	.34	-.11	.26	-.12
	Female	-.00	-.04	-.10	.08	-.46	-.22	.17	.21	.04	-.12	.09	.29	-.29
Charlotte	Male	.12	.21	-.03	-.00	-.03	.49	.17	-.17	.09	-.11	.24	.12	.08
	Female	-.26	-.04	.03	.35	.18	.05	.00	-.12	.06	.20	-.06	.02	.07
Arthur	Male	.17	.08	-.18	.02	-.27	-.00	.08	.06	.02	-.04	-.10	-.13	.09
	Female	.01	-.05	-.11	-.04	-.11	-.04	-.04	.04	.24	-.11	.10	.02	-.11
William	Male	-.23	-.05	.03	-.19	.39	-.61	.15	.32	.25	.15	-.07	.24	-.27
	Female	.01	.00	.06	.12	-.32	.11	-.07	-.20	.49	.16	.03	-.09	.03
Roberta	Male	-.18	-.05	.15	.11	.11	-.16	.13	.22	-.09	.25	-.16	.18	.11
	Female	-.33	-.25	-.17	-.12	.29	-.37	.00	.34	-.09	.21	-.19	.19	-.31
Paula	Male	-.29	-.05	-.29	-.31	-.13	-.10	.31	.38	.29	.21	-.17	.09	-.17
	Female	-.02	-.08	.06	-.05	-.52	.53	-.05	-.18	-.06	-.08	-.05	.11	-.30
Linda	Male	-.21	.22	.25	-.16	.23	-.09	.24	.16	.13	-.05	.08	.37	-.21
	Female	-.04	-.26	-.08	-.33	-.06	-.02	.05	.09	.15	.08	-.06	.13	-.22
James	Male	.03	-.16	.00	-.14	-.11	.14	.05	.06	.03	-.08	-.03	.17	-.20
	Female	.03	-.31	-.44	.07	-.32	.09	-.08	.10	-.00	.10	-.29	.15	.15
							Fall 1968							
Delores	Male	-.03	.00	-.19	-.02	-.11	.38	.15	-.04	-.45	.25	-.10	.27	-.17
	Female	-.06	-.14	-.16	.14	-.01	-.22	-.10	-.02	-.07	.12	.02	.21	-.31
Adrian	Male	.05	-.25	-.19	-.18	-.01	.03	-.27	.02	.09	.31	-.17	.05	-.09
	Female	-.25	.08	-.02	-.05	.19	.08	.19	.31	-.28	-.01	-.04	-.03	-.26
Lee	Male	-.33	-.04	-.16	-.12	.07	-.18	.08	.42	.04	.01	.00	.25	-.17
	Female	-.05	.11	.02	-.03	-.01	.19	.04	-.01	.34	.24	-.05	.28	-.38
Pamela	Male	.02	-.32	-.28	-.03	.30	-.47	-.05	.39	-.19	.17	.11	-.02	-.51
	Female	.04	-.09	-.16	.05	-.09	-.23	-.14	.14	.11	-.00	-.20	.24	-.11
Robert A.	Male	.26	-.16	-.13	-.10	-.05	-.11	-.30	.03	.11	.02	-.05	.01	.17
	Female	-.13	-.01	-.03	-.22	-.13	-.19	.42	.17	.03	.10	.13	.09	-.15
Gerhard	Male	.20	-.13	-.06	-.18	-.09	-.13	-.08	.09	-.24	-.08	-.01	.15	-.14
	Female	-.33	-.10	-.18	-.08	-.03	-.00	-.06	.24	-.13	-.03	-.03	.20	-.13
Arthur	Male	-.23	-.18	-.39	-.54	.05	-.24	.14	.44	.12	-.08	-.49	.23	-.46
	Female	-.04	-.14	-.36	-.16	-.03	.32	-.23	.22	.15	-.01	-.05	.04	-.35
Michael	Male	-.19	.01	.07	.03	.04	.20	-.01	-.03	.18	.10	-.03	.27	-.10
	Female	-.01	-.23	-.10	-.11	.07	-.28	.27	.20	-.07	.05	.23	.11	-.13
Robert M.	Male	-.1	-.01	.00	-.02	.22	.35	.03	.00	-.03	.27	-.05	.44	-.41
	Female	-.04	.05	.08	.33	-.18	-.03	-.35	.03	-.18	-.06	-.00	-.04	-.04
Harvey	Male	-.20	.22	.07	-.39	.27	-.35	.37	.43	-.01	.48	-.33	.44	-.21
	Female	.02	.06	-.10	.20	.04	.20	-.11	-.06	.24	.04	.02	-.07	-.26
Janet	Male	-.22	-.00	.25	-.41	.12	-.17	.33	-.00	.02	-.51	.06	-.20	-.20
	Female	-.03	.05	-.09	.13	.20	-.16	-.07	.17	.16	.22	-.04	.11	-.09

Table 4 (con't)

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
							Spring 1969							
Delores	Male	-.05	-.10	-.11	-.13	.20	-.32	.08	.19	.29	.29	-.03	.26	-.27
	Female	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	.09	-.02	-.27	.31	.12	-.15
Lee	Male	-.28	-.21	-.20	.20	.09	.01	-.02	.11	.29	.00	-.02	-.30	-.28
	Female	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	.06	.05	.24	.07	.19	-.03
Pamela	Male	-.12	.03	-.29	-.59	-.18	-.04	.20	.27	.43	-.01	-.12	.01	-.35
	Female	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	.22	.31	.03	.01	.11	-.10
Robert A.	Male	-.25	-.07	-.01	-.03	-.05	-.04	-.37	.15	-.12	-.44	-.11	.08	-.63
	Female	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	.07	.11	.10	-.25	-.05	-.07
Jacqulyn	Male	.10	.13	-.17	.03	.27	-.20	.09	-.02	.30	.36	-.02	.12	-.02
	Female	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-.14	-.06	-.08	.08	.04	-.02
Arthur	Male	.10	-.17	-.45	-.05	-.03	.08	-.22	-.02	.26	.65	-.25	.18	-.05
	Female	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	.10	-.16	-.15	-.14	-.35	.07
Michael	Male	-.10	-.23	-.22	-.21	.11	-.44	.25	.40	.19	.23	-.20	-.13	-.38
	Female	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	.50	-.09	-.26	-.20	.28	-.30
Robert M.	Male	.23	.43	.23	-.05	.19	.38	-.53	.05	-.12	-.45	.04	-.37	.02
	Female	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	.13	.29	-.08	.20	.10	.00
Harvey	Male	-.48	.07	-.24	-.25	.52	-.68	.36	.37	-.02	-.27	-.37	.25	-.27
	Female	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-.04	.44	.16	-.17	-.34	-.04
Janet	Male	-.24	-.44	-.21	.26	.01	-.05	.15	.35	.26	-.32	-.27	-.01	-.09
	Female	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	.29	-.32	.16	-.17	.18	-.31
Deena	Male	-.04	.22	-.20	-.06	-.02	.08	-.18	-.02	.15	-.25	.13	.03	-.23
	Female	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	.18	-.07	-.14	.17	.03	-.15
							Fall 1969							
LuAnn	Male	-.20	.12	.12	.07	.11	-.15	.02	.19	-.01	.21	.17	.50	-.00
	Female	.05	-.11	.05	.02	.17	.10	-.03	.19	.17	-.29	.08	.16	-.27
Severine	Male	.09	-.22	-.26	-.31	-.03	.02	.22	.12	.10	.45	-.24	-.12	-.25
	Female	-.25	.18	.19	-.02	-.28	.00	-.07	.05	-.04	.17	-.04	.32	-.28
Jack	Male	-.19	-.06	-.21	-.19	.42	-.12	-.26	.06	-.06	-.25	.05	.25	-.13
	Female	-.21	.12	.08	-.06	.09	-.34	.11	.19	-.25	.24	.08	.32	-.31
Robert A.	Male	.01	-.12	.07	-.12	-.23	.13	.33	.00	-.11	-.05	-.12	-.18	.00
	Female	.14	-.20	-.08	.05	-.05	-.12	.19	.19	-.21	.26	-.19	.27	-.10
Leslie	Male	-.18	-.23	.15	.29	.35	-.44	-.28	.02	-.33	.46	-.13	.29	.03
	Female	-.03	.13	.14	-.06	.14	-.10	.33	.11	.08	.14	.08	.25	-.33
Kay	Male	-.09	-.02	-.06	-.13	-.15	-.06	.03	.11	-.00	-.37	-.20	-.36	-.09
	Female	-.07	.12	.01	.34	.11	.07	.08	.25	-.08	.12	.05	.13	-.20
Violet	Male	.07	-.01	-.58	.10	-.28	-.09	-.21	.04	.47	-.19	.29	-.06	.01
	Female	-.17	-.18	-.31	.00	-.07	-.04	.27	.07	.04	-.14	-.22	.17	-.27
Anthony	Male	-.07	.26	.40	.43	-.37	-.12	-.33	-.43	-.15	-.18	.29	-.11	-.31
	Female	-.24	.05	.07	-.11	-.23	-.36	.24	.23	.09	.10	-.06	.33	-.41
Andrew	Male	.38	.16	-.22	.12	.03	.03	.04	-.18	.19	.02	.00	-.22	.00
	Female	-.29	.10	-.09	.17	-.01	-.13	-.22	.14	-.24	.03	.14	.23	-.18
Antonia	Male	-.26	.14	-.00	-.08	.68	-.34	.09	.21	-.07	-.16	.05	-.06	-.04
	Female	-.24	-.27	-.18	-.11	.10	-.14	.35	.37	.21	.19	-.14	.01	-.53
Robert M.	Male	-.62	-.22	-.10	-.13	.47	-.05	.37	.28	.12	.30	-.20	+.36	-.52
	Female	-.16	-.17	-.12	.24	-.02	-.02	-.14	.22	-.02	.12	-.22	-.16	-.36
Janet	Male	-.22	-.27	-.18	.24	.01	-.03	.14	.10	.52	.11	-.22	.06	.02
	Female	-.07	.06	.10	.09	-.09	-.04	.17	.15	.18	-.05	-.12	.03	-.08

*Data unavailable.

Table 5

Student's Political Position by Course Evaluation
(gamma)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Spring 1968	-.05	.02	-.00	-.13	.00	-.03	-.01	.02	.07	.08	.01	.08	.06
Fall 1968	-.08	.00	-.00	-.07	-.02	-.08	.01	*	*	*	*	*	*
Spring 1969	-.11	.00	.00	-.16	.02	-.06	.04	.18	.11	-.10	-.06	-.02	-.02
Fall 1969	-.07	-.11	-.12	-.03	.04	-.09	.05	.15	.04	.07	-.03	.09	.03

*Data unavailable.

Table 6

Student's Political Position by Course Evaluation
Controlled for Number of Semesters in College
(gamma)

Semesters in College	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
						Spring 1968							
1	-.18	-.18	-.13	-.47	.05	-.38	.08	.02	-.11	.14	-.01	.06	.10
2	-.02	.01	-.00	-.12	.00	.05	-.02	.07	.12	.03	-.02	.13	.01
3 or more	-.04	.09	.00	-.07	.01	-.03	-.02	.00	.06	.12	.05	.04	.12
						Fall 1968							
1	-.11	-.00	-.04	-.16	-.04	-.07	.01	.15	.10	-.00	-.06	-.03	-.03
2	-.10	.33	-.00	-.23	.12	-.09	-.01	.24	-.03	-.13	-.05	.17	.06
3 or more	-.05	-.08	.01	.01	-.00	-.11	.06	.12	.11	-.04	-.08	.06	.00
						Spring 1969							
1	-.25	.04	.00	-.31	.04	-.02	.07	.21	.27	-.04	-.08	-.08	.04
2	-.10	-.07	-.05	-.02	.05	-.01	.06	.24	.11	-.04	-.15	-.01	-.07
3 or more	-.08	.07	.06	-.26	-.01	-.09	.00	.13	.07	-.18	-.02	-.05	.01
						Fall 1969							
1	-.07	-.12	-.11	-.00	.04	-.04	.00	.14	.02	.05	-.07	.07	.01
2	-.38	.10	-.00	.06	.14	-.20	.03	.20	-.06	.36	-.03	.27	-.07
3 or more	-.00	-.12	-.15	-.11	.00	-.16	.16	.14	.03	.05	.04	.12	.05

Table 7

Student's Political Position by Course Evaluation Controlled for Tutor (gamma)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
						Spring 1968							
Adrian	-.01	-.00	.04	.23	-.03	.11	-.17	.06	-.01	-.03	-.08	.03	.40
Samuel	.17	-.13	.09	.08	-.03	-.04	-.24	-.32	.11	.11	.22	.19	.32
Gerhard	-.09	-.24	-.27	-.24	.50	-.21	.24	.24	.05	.28	.07	.05	.06
Charlotte	-.03	.06	-.10	-.17	.15	.11	.03	-.08	.15	.20	-.01	.08	.04
Arthur	-.17	.10	-.11	-.20	-.01	-.28	.24	.11	.02	.28	.00	.08	-.24
William	-.17	.11	-.03	-.27	.00	-.12	.05	.24	.31	.06	-.08	.44	.06
Roberta	.17	-.04	.08	-.26	-.28	-.04	-.02	-.20	.11	-.21	-.08	-.07	.04
Paula	-.30	-.08	-.14	-.29	.09	-.00	-.10	.28	.01	.24	-.32	-.08	-.14
Linda	-.22	.22	.23	-.08	-.15	-.04	-.09	.16	.08	-.02	.19	-.01	.09
James	.07	.12	-.05	-.07	-.14	.14	-.04	-.10	-.10	-.13	.01	.19	.06
						Fall 1968							
Delores	-.09	-.12	-.09	.20	-.18	.21	-.18	-.07	.06	-.28	-.09	.13	-.19
Adrian	-.31	.11	-.00	-.08	.03	-.05	.25	.26	.00	.06	.01	-.16	-.20
Lee	-.18	.03	.09	-.05	.10	-.40	-.06	.13	.06	.01	.02	.04	.11
Pamela	-.13	.00	-.01	-.08	-.04	-.13	-.05	.16	.17	.07	-.05	-.10	.13
Robert A.	-.19	-.22	-.03	-.28	-.18	-.11	.21	.12	.10	.02	-.26	.08	-.17
Gerhard	.01	.10	.08	-.14	-.06	-.07	.01	.00	.05	-.01	-.09	.03	.08
Arthur	-.12	-.07	-.18	-.02	-.06	-.02	.33	.15	-.00	-.01	-.15	.09	-.02
Michael	-.16	.15	.10	-.16	.23	.07	-.11	.20	.13	-.00	-.00	.02	.01
Robert M.	-.25	-.14	-.09	-.03	-.07	-.27	-.15	.37	.18	-.09	.06	.06	-.06
Harvey	.37	-.06	-.07	-.04	.08	.19	-.01	-.19	.25	-.15	-.09	-.01	.16
Janet	-.15	.07	-.01	-.12	-.02	-.00	.12	.30	.06	.08	-.16	.13	-.11

Table 7 (con't)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
						Spring 1969							
Delores	-.20	.06	.21	-.09	-.23	.15	.05	.21	.31	.00	-.24	-.21	-.04
Lee	.10	-.06	.05	-.11	.09	-.07	-.06	.31	.20	-.09	-.10	-.01	.08
Pamela	-.25	.27	.09	-.38	.21	-.31	-.00	.09	-.03	.15	-.02	-.02	-.44
Robert A.	.02	.20	.15	-.32	.00	.10	-.25	-.02	.12	-.34	.11	-.13	-.06
Jacqulyn	-.16	.15	.19	-.03	.17	-.28	.01	.18	-.05	.29	-.13	.13	-.03
Arthur	-.12	.04	.03	-.29	.19	.00	.14	.12	.23	-.36	.11	.10	-.00
Michael	-.22	-.27	-.05	-.25	.40	.11	.29	.36	.04	-.03	-.25	.02	-.18
Robert M.	.06	-.08	-.03	-.13	-.22	.48	.02	.08	.24	-.39	-.16	-.13	.18
Harvey	-.27	-.16	-.16	-.18	-.07	-.10	.12	.40	.18	-.09	-.18	.03	.26
Janet	-.14	-.09	-.03	-.13	.05	-.33	.04	.02	.10	-.13	-.11	-.11	.04
Deena	-.21	.31	.00	-.01	-.15	-.07	.11	.25	.03	-.45	.18	.04	-.08
						Fall 1969							
LuAnn	.06	.09	-.03	.12	.08	.23	.03	.29	-.05	.00	-.16	.11	-.01
Severine	-.27	-.27	-.27	-.20	-.23	.03	.35	.23	.06	.04	.15	-.08	.18
Jack	-.23	-.50	-.54	-.15	.04	-.09	-.01	.31	.11	.27	-.39	.13	-.12
Robert A.	-.19	-.05	-.27	.12	-.05	-.11	.11	.20	-.01	.23	.18	-.00	.02
Leslie	-.00	-.32	-.24	-.41	.33	-.25	.59	.07	.11	-.00	-.28	.23	-.21
Kay	-.03	.13	.00	.05	-.23	-.14	-.54	-.06	.15	-.26	.02	.00	.11
Violet	-.14	-.31	-.23	-.11	.01	-.10	.11	.16	.03	.10	.01	.16	.00
Anthony	.03	.14	.20	.03	.11	-.09	.18	.05	.03	.06	.04	-.00	.07
Andrew	-.06	-.09	-.17	.09	-.01	-.18	.22	.28	.06	.24	-.07	.19	.09
Antonia	.05	.06	.02	.06	.26	.00	.02	.13	-.18	.09	.26	.06	.19
Robert M.	-.00	-.05	.02	.05	-.02	.03	-.09	.01	.00	-.09	.06	.10	.15
Janet	-.00	.04	.03	-.01	.31	-.47	-.03	.22	.18	.20	.01	.18	.00

Table 8

Student's Political Position by Course Evaluation Controlled for Sex of Student (gamma)

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Spring 1968	Males	-.07	-.01	.00	.02	.03	-.09	.02	.04	.09	.12	-.02	.08	-.04
	Females	-.01	.07	-.00	-.00	- 03	.05	- 07	.00	.03	.03	.05	.11	.12
Fall 1968	Males	-.03	-.02	.02	.12	.00	-.05	.06	.19	.03	-.03	-.04	.01	.01
	Females	-.11	.01	-.03	.11	-.03	-.10	-.01	.10	.14	-.03	-.08	.04	-.06
Spring 1969	Males	-.13	-.00	-.03	.11	.06	-.09	.06	.19	.14	-.06	-.07	.01	-.02
	Females	-.09	.00	.03	.05	-.02	-.04	.00	.18	.07	-.13	-.07	-.04	-.02
Fall 1969	Males	-.07	-.03	-.09	.13	-.07	.03	.03	.11	-.06	.20	.00	.20	.05
	Females	-.04	.13	-.12	.06	.07	-.14	.07	.15	.09	.00	-.06	.05	.00

Table 9

Student's Political Position by Course Evaluation
Controlled for Tutor and Sex of Student
(gamma)

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
							Spring 1968							
Adrian	Male	-.21	-.12	.18	-.02	.05	.01	-.17	.00	.10	.01	-.13	.03	.50
	Female	.08	.12	-.07	-.12	-.12	.17	-.19	.06	-.13	-.07	-.04	.01	.34
Samuel	Male	.27	-.18	-.04	-.14	-.02	-.15	-.27	-.39	.20	.50	.29	.40	.26
	Female	.08	-.06	.26	.01	-.01	.12	-.19	-.25	.00	-.63	.16	-.05	.37
Gerhard	Male	-.10	-.23	-.35	.15	.60	-.62	.41	.46	-.10	.32	.05	.05	.04
	Female	-.07	-.22	-.14	-.09	.30	.24	.16	.05	.17	.21	.18	.09	.03
Charlotte	Male	-.07	.17	.01	.50	.06	-.01	-.02	-.13	.04	.09	-.10	.18	.14
	Female	-.00	-.00	-.17	.11	.23	.23	.09	.00	.28	.29	.08	-.04	-.08
Arthur	Male	-.10	-.00	-.23	.08	-.19	-.27	.48	.09	-.02	.29	-.12	.18	-.36
	Female	-.23	.20	-.02	-.05	.11	-.25	-.04	.11	.04	.30	.12	.12	-.10
William	Male	-.24	.03	-.05	.18	.26	-.32	.07	.27	.54	.50	-.30	.17	-.16
	Female	-.16	.21	.04	-.25	-.26	.10	-.03	.22	.19	-.19	.09	.59	.20
Roberta	Male	.05	.06	.15	-.07	-.31	.04	-.13	-.15	.19	-.33	-.25	-.16	-.03
	Female	.35	-.20	-.05	-.03	-.29	-.10	.15	-.23	-.06	-.13	.15	.14	.17
Paula	Male	-.18	-.16	-.31	-.09	.16	.02	.04	.32	-.06	.23	-.44	-.04	-.07
	Female	-.43	.02	.22	.06	-.18	.02	-.30	.17	.04	.31	-.15	-.16	-.32
Linda	Male	-.37	.29	.45	.06	-.20	.17	.10	.33	.29	-.10	.32	.01	-.09
	Female	-.05	.19	.02	.27	-.09	-.21	-.25	.04	-.07	.04	.05	-.05	.24
James	Male	-.02	.00	.09	-.40	-.26	.12	-.01	.05	-.20	-.34	.13	.09	-.17
	Female	.22	.33	-.20	-.12	.00	.20	-.06	-.38	.00	.18	-.13	.24	.43
							Fall 1968							
Delores	Male	.06	.15	.23	.03	-.03	.40	-.18	-.04	-.21	-.32	.11	.20	.06
	Female	-.32	-.26	-.31	-.00	-.30	-.02	-.17	-.03	.16	-.22	-.21	.01	-.25
Adrian	Male	-.09	.09	-.08	-.52	.26	-.05	.41	.42	-.10	-.11	-.05	-.16	-.10
	Female	-.55	.12	.04	.10	-.08	-.06	.15	.17	.09	.20	.06	-.18	-.25
Lee	Male	-.22	-.10	-.04	-.04	.08	-.37	-.07	.09	-.00	.02	-.02	.12	.10
	Female	-.12	.32	.33	-.01	.09	-.37	-.10	.21	.11	-.02	.09	-.07	.11
Pamela	Male	.00	-.31	-.35	.38	.19	-.60	.05	.50	.20	.27	-.43	-.08	.14
	Female	.21	.15	.15	.12	-.17	.08	-.15	-.00	.27	-.03	.09	-.10	.11
Robert A.	Male	-.05	-.09	.23	.35	-.54	.11	-.13	-.09	-.32	-.46	-.27	.13	-.01
	Female	-.33	-.37	-.18	.43	.05	-.31	.47	.29	.35	.32	-.31	.05	-.23
Gerhard	Male	.60	.21	.25	.18	-.27	.20	-.53	-.17	.39	-.37	.18	-.21	.24
	Female	-.27	-.04	-.04	.39	.06	-.13	.05	-.00	-.13	.10	-.16	.16	-.07
Arthur	Male	.10	-.72	-.44	.50	.22	-.50	.49	.15	.20	.54	-09	-.20	-.11
	Female	-.21	.21	-.10	-.00	-.26	.40	.27	.18	-.26	-.30	-.18	.23	.05
Michael	Male	-.12	.25	.25	.86	.45	.21	.32	.58	.00	.13	.16	.05	.05
	Female	-.15	.10	.02	.11	.08	-.01	-.35	.03	.20	-.11	-.09	.02	-.01
Robert M.	Male	-.48	-.12	.00	.27	.03	-.37	.12	.46	.29	-.29	.17	.25	-.13
	Female	-.09	-.19	-.17	-.08	-.12	-.22	-.33	.34	.18	-.02	.01	.00	-.05
Harvey	Male	.58	-.21	-.20	-.21	.10	.46	.20	.01	.12	-.04	-.46	-.12	.25
	Female	.29	.05	-.03	.09	.20	-.02	-.13	-.35	.34	-.22	.08	.07	.08
Janet	Male	-.23	.11	.03	-.16	-.29	.17	-.17	.16	.09	.29	.07	.09	-.26
	Female	-.04	.03	-.05	.32	.22	.12	.35	.43	.05	-.04	-.37	.24	-.01

Table 9 (con't)

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
							Spring 1969							
Delores	Male	-.22	-.09	.22	.36	.01	.01	.10	.17	.39	-.09	-.09	-.12	-.05
	Female	-.20	.38	.20	-.27	-.83	.33	-.09	.29	.22	.28	-.52	-.43	-.09
Lee	Male	-.11	.22	.33	-.11	-.04	.16	.05	.27	.08	-.20	.02	.08	.18
	Female	.41	-.44	-.22	.38	.38	-.48	-.40	.38	.46	.C2	-.42	-.09	-.09
Pamela	Male	-.38	.28	.17	.23	.45	-.33	.06	.04	-.38	.07	.07	.24	-.52
	Female	-.15	.19	-.08	.16	.14	-.36	-.13	.17	.12	.20	-.17	-.01	-.38
Robert A.	Male	-.57	.22	.08	-.38	.50	-.89	.10	.15	-.08	-.09	-.26	.08	-.25
	Female	.45	.22	.22	.11	-.47	.47	-.47	-.24	.29	-.44	.54	-.32	+.07
Jacqulyn	Male	-.06	.21	.19	.15	.09	-.24	-.12	.12	-.19	.31	-.16	-.14	-.00
	Female	-.27	.02	.18	.16	.26	-.34	.07	.23	.01	.29	-.14	.31	-.08
Arthur	Male	.12	.00	.05	.27	.40	-.22	.15	.09	.20	-.16	.20	.22	.00
	Female	-.43	.06	.01	.18	-.12	.42	.10	.12	.26	-.50	.08	-.01	-.01
Michael	Male	-.25	-.44	-.35	.74	.47	-.73	.45	.65	.04	-.15	-.24	.17	-.34
	Female	-.17	-.27	.03	-.16	.21	.52	.14	.04	-.05	.09	-.48	.05	.04
Robert M.	Male	.44	-.26	-.01	.46	-.51	.45	-.40	.18	.32	-.40	-.42	.01	.07
	Female	-.19	-.18	-.37	.51	-.13	.16	.39	.40	.03	.04	.23	-.14	.16
Harvey	Male	-.28	-.31	-.40	.12	-.04	.02	.19	.43	.40	.08	-.13	.12	.20
	Female	-.37	.03	.13	-.19	-.34	-.32	.03	.34	-.08	-.46	-.22	-.06	.35
Janet	Male	-.15	-.07	-.11	-.31	-.10	-.44	-.10	-.00	.27	.10	-.06	-.28	-.02
	Female	-.12	-.11	.07	.11	.17	-.15	.30	.08	-.15	-.59	-.21	.06	.20
Deena	Male	-.30	.31	-.16	-.04	-.06	-.06	.20	.43	.05	-.32	.20	.20	-.06
	Female	-.04	.37	.34	-.15	-.38	-.07	.00	.01	.01	-.77	.09	-.35	-.18
							Fall 1969							
LuAnn	Male	-.11	.03	.00	.32	-.24	.45	.06	.24	-.15	.07	.00	.35	.07
	Female	.36	.18	-.03	.10	.27	.08	.02	.34	.15	.03	-.25	-.06	-.10
Severine	Male	-.22	.18	-.09	.29	-.26	.22	.52	.19	.24	.01	.68	-.01	.15
	Female	-.27	-.49	-.33	-.00	-.26	-.15	.28	.29	-.04	-.01	-.14	-.07	.17
Jack	Male	-.51	-.55	-.52	.38	-.31	.62	-.02	.72	-.01	.61	-.63	.36	.12
	Female	-.06	-.48	-.52	-.04	.17	-.24	-.02	.09	.10	.02	-.27	-.09	-.14
Robert A.	Male	-.22	.06	-.06	-.00	-.26	.19	-.21	-.01	.33	.38	.29	-.26	.14
	Female	-.08	-.22	-.41	.18	.03	-.37	.27	.30	-.21	.17	.02	.17	-.06
Leslie	Male	.18	-.16	-.38	.21	.20	-.12	.33	-.39	.86	.20	-.34	.74	.14
	Female	-.02	-.38	-.30	.36	.37	-.29	.66	.23	.04	.02	-.31	.13	-.21
Kay	Male	-.07	.09	.02	.01	-.23	.15	-.39	.07	-.29	-.10	-.01	.08	-.09
	Female	.15	.25	.02	.06	-.24	-.28	-.66	-.33	.67	-.35	.11	-.02	.30
Violet	Male	-.36	-.20	-.37	.57	.25	-.70	.53	-.08	-.24	-.19	.02	.40	-.54
	Female	-.13	-.31	-.20	-.01	-.04	.05	.02	.26	.10	.22	.02	.09	.17
Anthony	Male	-.33	.16	.00	-.25	.04	-.41	.09	.24	.01	-.22	-.01	-.11	.14
	Female	.21	.10	.26	.02	.08	.08	.21	-.06	.00	.13	.01	.03	.01
Andrew	Male	.27	-.15	-.47	.18	-.27	-.19	.02	.34	.11	.38	-.14	.17	.00
	Female	-.21	-.05	-.03	-.04	.09	-.10	.38	.23	.00	.18	-.08	.30	.05
Antonia	Male	.28	.04	.04	-.08	.41	-.14	.02	-.14	-.29	.44	.50	.05	.42
	Female	-.11	.06	.00	.12	.04	.11	.02	.27	-.13	-.20	.06	.05	*
Robert M.	Male	.06	.18	.05	-.20	.11	.01	-.10	-.02	-.30	.20	.21	.36	.10
	Female	-.05	-.15	.03	-.12	-.08	.05	-.09	.05	.18	-.30	-.01	-.02	*
Janet	Male	.15	-.21	-.13	.18	.09	-.20	.03	.12	-.01	.48	-.11	.50	.18
	Female	-.07	.20	.10	.31	.45	-.68	-.02	.37	.31	.02	.08	.07	*

*Data unavailable.

Table 10

Student's Social Class Position by Course Evaluation
(gamma)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Spring 1968	.04	.06	.02	.03	-.00	.03	-.03	-.04	-.04	.00	.06	-.09
Fall 1968	.02	-.02	.04	.03	-.01	-.07	.03	-.02	-.07	.00	-.02	-.10
Spring 1969	.04	.04	.04	.17	.03	-.01	-.08	-.10	-.08	.10	.04	-.05
Fall 1969	.04	.00	-.04	.01	-.05	.01	-.06	-.03	.02	-.07	.02	-.19

Table 11

Student's Social Class Position by Course Evaluation Controlled for Sex of Student (gamma)

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Spring 1968	Males	.04	.06	.04	.08	-.04	.11	-.12	-.04	.03	.00	.11	-.10
	Females	.03	.06	-.00	-.00	.03	-.05	.04	-.03	-.08	.00	.02	-.11
Fall 1968	Males	.07	-.12	-.06	.07	-.04	-.07	.04	-.02	.16	-.04	-.11	-.11
	Females	.03	.03	.10	.04	-.01	-.04	.01	-.07	-.12	.04	.03	-.04
Spring 1969	Males	.05	.02	.03	.21	-.03	.02	-.15	-.10	-.11	-.09	-.02	-.06
	Females	.04	.06	.04	.11	.12	-.07	-.00	-.11	-.10	-.11	.09	-.06
Fall 1969	Males	.05	.05	-.03	.11	-.09	.15	-.18	-.08	.03	-.12	.00	-.20
	Females	.04	-.01	-.05	-.05	-.04	-.05	-.00	-.03	-.06	-.04	.01	-.18

Table 12

Student's Social Class Position by Course Evaluation Controlled for Tutor (gamma)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
						Spring 1968						
Adrian	.02	.09	-.00	.10	-.19	.16	-.07	-.01	-.08	.09	-.03	-.22
Samuel	.12	-.03	-.04	.16	-.10	-.08	-.11	-.12	.01	.03	-.01	.01
Gerhard	-.09	-.23	-.09	-.19	.20	-.27	-.00	-.04	-.18	.11	-.18	-.12
Charlotte	.08	.20	-.04	-.15	.01	.05	.25	-.04	.08	.04	.11	-.04
Arthur	-.05	.05	.14	-.05	.18	.15	-.32	-.16	-.02	.14	.22	-.13
William	.08	.11	.02	.24	-.21	.08	-.13	-.03	-.03	-.20	.00	-.43
Roberta	.06	.14	-.08	-.15	.06	-.03	.27	.03	.03	.02	.08	.20
Paula	.15	.08	-.02	.01	.23	-.16	-.14	.05	.11	-.19	.20	-.02
Linda	-.10	.21	.28	.28	-.14	.28	-.03	-.12	.04	-.10	.28	-.14
James	.04	-.08	.09	-.01	.06	.06	-.16	-.11	-.18	.19	.13	-.11
						Fall 1968						
Delores	.04	.05	.23	.19	-.20	-.19	.00	-.03	.01	-.13	-.03	-.22
Adrian	.14	.17	.28	.13	-.13	.28	-.24	-.15	.02	-.16	.04	-.22
Lee	.05	-.15	-.09	.06	.10	-.14	.22	.25	-.01	-.01	-.18	-.22
Pamela	-.01	.09	.04	-.21	.07	-.01	.19	-.01	-.02	-.01	.01	.13
Robert A.	.11	.04	.06	.11	-.05	-.23	-.06	-.00	-.07	.05	-.09	-.07
Gerhard	.10	.16	.11	.17	-.00	-.21	-.06	-.05	-.15	.18	-.00	.15
Arthur	-.09	-.18	-.18	.08	.04	-.01	.12	.03	-.04	.10	-.10	-.30
Michael	-.03	-.15	-.24	-.14	.02	-.31	.23	-.07	-.04	-.03	.01	-.03
Robert M.	-.10	.05	.06	.01	.04	.01	.18	.02	-.18	.01	-.05	.06
Harvey	-.14	.07	.23	-.24	-.16	.19	-.23	-.09	.13	-.03	.11	-.15
Janet	.15	-.15	-.06	.13	.19	-.18	.01	-.15	.10	.03	-.06	-.26

Table 12 (con't)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
						Spring 1969						
Delores	.03	-.17	-.18	.26	.23	-.19	-.22	.02	-.02	-.02	.00	.01
Lee	.04	-.12	-.16	.27	-.49	.18	-.18	-.33	-.10	-.30	.23	-.06
Pamela	.15	-.02	.08	.23	.03	.03	.03	-.18	-.13	-.11	.01	-.04
Robert A.	.14	.17	-.14	.45	.27	.00	.05	-.29	.29	.08	-.13	-.04
Jacqulyn	.18	-.21	.07	.09	-.03	-.19	.00	.02	-.21	-.21	.12	-.01
Arthur	.04	.34	.32	-.07	.06	.24	.02	-.20	-.40	-.33	.41	.38
Michael	.03	.12	.05	.34	.32	.27	-.15	-.33	.06	.14	.10	-.08
Robert M.	.09	-.12	-.17	.02	.42	.04	-.28	.23	.12	.09	-.02	.01
Harvey	.20	.18	.37	.08	-.17	.19	-.09	-.23	-.04	-.26	.02	-.40
Janet	-.02	.08	.07	.13	.04	-.34	-.27	-.13	-.01	-.19	-.19	-.29
Deena	-.30	.01	-.04	.05	-.03	-.13	.09	.26	-.39	.08	-.07	.19
						Fall 1969						
LuAnn	-.23	-.05	-.16	-.16	.07	-.20	.16	.15	-.03	.18	-.04	-.15
Severine	.03	-.02	-.07	.25	.22	.14	-.04	-.06	-.02	.03	.36	-.26
Jack	.14	.08	.08	-.03	-.14	.14	-.06	-.11	.29	-.11	-.05	-.12
Robert A.	-.13	.27	.14	-.00	-.09	-.14	-.02	.08	-.17	-.05	.03	-.25
Leslie	-.08	-.07	-.09	-.01	-.26	.18	-.16	.03	.09	.02	-.13	-.22
Kay	.14	-.01	-.14	-.19	-.10	-.07	-.05	-.15	-.16	-.20	-.07	-.52
Violet	-.01	.09	.03	-.08	.07	-.03	-.11	.04	-.16	.08	.10	-.05
Anthony	.17	-.03	-.10	.17	.06	.09	-.27	-.17	.01	-.15	.27	-.35
Andrew	.05	-.17	-.03	.18	.09	.10	.09	.09	.12	-.09	-.03	-.27
Antonia	.17	.11	-.01	.10	-.10	-.17	-.19	-.04	.06	.07	.05	-.07
Robert M.	.10	.04	.01	-.14	-.11	-.25	.10	-.00	.04	-.22	-.11	-.19
Janet	.25	.01	-.01	-.01	-.11	.13	-.25	-.23	-.17	-.34	.03	.20

Table 13

Student's Social Class Position by Course Evaluation Controlled for Tutor and Sex of Student (gamma)

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
							Spring 1968						
Adrian	Male	-.36	.17	.02	.22	.02	.03	-.25	-.01	-.13	.35	-.10	-.17
	Female	.21	.10	.02	.11	-.35	.21	-.04	-.12	-.09	-.11	.08	-.26
Samuel	Male	.08	-.08	-.10	.11	-.04	.01	-.10	-.03	.29	.27	.11	.07
	Female	.33	-.05	-.04	.40	-.09	-.24	-.10	-.16	-.33	-.23	-.11	-.04
Gerhard	Male	-.35	-.08	.00	-.26	.07	-.24	.22	.13	-.15	.08	.00	.15
	Female	.10	-.35	-.13	-.11	.40	-.28	-.15	-.12	-.28	.15	-.19	-.32
Charlotte	Male	.19	.37	.16	-.16	-.16	.11	.07	-.15	.12	-.04	.18	-.07
	Female	-.09	.01	-.30	-.15	.14	-.03	.50	.14	.00	.11	.01	.01
Arthur	Male	.27	-.07	.06	.23	.18	.09	-.36	-.31	.11	.25	.26	-.24
	Female	-.41	.16	.21	-.32	.20	.20	-.23	-.00	-.11	.02	.18	.01
William	Male	.26	.16	.10	.43	-.36	.44	-.56	-.18	-.01	-.23	.21	-.71
	Female	-.24	.12	.02	.14	-.08	-.18	.12	.10	-.01	-.18	-.12	-.18
Roberta	Male	-.09	.22	-.10	-.14	.16	-.13	.09	.24	-.06	-.11	.04	.24
	Female	.24	.06	-.01	-.16	-.03	.09	.49	-.28	.11	.15	.20	.13
Paula	Male	.20	.01	-.01	.08	.23	.05	-.12	.02	.29	-.19	.17	.18
	Female	.10	.23	.06	-.03	.16	-.46	-.11	.04	-.32	-.18	.25	-.27
Linda	Male	-.16	.26	.26	.19	-.29	.64	-.04	-.12	-.13	-.32	.48	-.25
	Female	-.06	.17	.24	.32	.00	-.00	-.07	-.09	.11	.03	.10	-.04
James	Male	.02	-.26	.16	.12	-.17	.20	-.25	-.25	-.09	.14	.13	-.04
	Female	.07	.13	.05	-.18	.30	-.12	-.05	.06	-.17	.21	.16	-.17
							Fall 1968						
Delores	Male	.29	-.42	-.24	.28	-.33	-.39	-.04	.07	.06	-.21	-.29	.41
	Female	.03	.18	.38	.20	-.21	.05	-.05	-.21	-.05	-.05	.04	-.37
Adrian	Male	.25	-.09	.52	.33	-.23	.26	.09	-.43	-.18	-.12	-.02	-.15
	Female	.14	.25	.10	.08	-.16	.35	-.40	.04	.17	-.17	.08	-.20
Lee	Male	-.00	-.07	-.10	.14	.08	-.13	.43	.30	.18	.10	-.41	-.16
	Female	.07	-.25	-.13	.03	.10	-.13	.04	.19	-.17	-.10	.02	-.29
Pamela	Male	.08	.01	.05	-.23	-.20	-.13	.03	.00	.55	-.24	.05	.11
	Female	-.04	.09	-.00	-.17	.20	.03	.22	-.03	-.28	.12	-.09	.16
Robert A.	Male	-.14	.02	-.06	.05	-.36	-.13	.01	.17	.02	-.23	.14	-.06
	Female	.32	.14	.20	.19	.02	-.17	-.16	-.13	-.09	.06	-.10	-.07
Gerhard	Male	.20	-.06	-.07	.16	.02	.21	-.05	-.26	.12	-.27	-.12	-.16
	Female	.07	.13	.19	.19	-.03	-.46	-.11	-.00	-.23	.35	.06	.33
Arthur	Male	.09	-.31	-.53	.03	.29	-.16	-.19	.39	.32	.56	-.13	-.45
	Female	-.13	-.15	.03	.15	-.13	.13	.19	-.19	-.12	.03	-.01	-.23
Michael	Male	-.13	-.13	-.42	-.01	.15	-.33	.32	.06	.32	-.05	.29	.18
	Female	.09	-.19	-.12	-.18	-.05	-.26	.22	-.11	-.18	-.02	-.09	-.06
Robert M.	Male	.03	-.10	.08	.05	-.02	-.47	-.09	-.08	-.08	.04	-.16	.08
	Female	-.11	.08	.09	-.01	.03	.19	.20	.02	-.17	-.03	.02	.06
Harvey	Male	-.02	-.43	.02	-.46	-.41	.53	-.30	-.14	.17	.35	-.35	-.50
	Female	-.20	-.22	.27	-.15	-.02	.04	-.19	-.05	.10	-.08	.23	.11
Janet	Male	.21	-.12	-.11	.25	.35	.00	-.22	-.26	.26	-.21	-.26	-.16
	Female	.13	-.16	-.01	.09	.04	-.25	.11	-.16	-.05	.17	.04	-.22

Table 13 (con't)

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
							Spring 1969						
Delores	Male	.16	-.10	.04	.21	.02	.07	-.09	-.04	.12	-.08	-.02	-.15
	Female	-.16	-.31	-.37	.36	.72	-.51	-.42	.08	-.17	.10	.07	.31
Lee	Male	.07	-.03	-.11	.28	.49	-.18	-.32	-.19	-.13	-.48	.16	-.19
	Female	.01	-.25	-.33	.36	-.47	.49	.15	-.55	-.02	.08	.39	.08
Pamela	Male	.20	-.18	-.09	.35	-.06	.28	-.21	-.26	-.14	-.01	-.20	-.29
	Female	.11	.17	.30	.15	.12	-.33	.41	-.10	-.10	-.22	.26	.18
Robert A.	Male	.08	.09	-.07	.24	.18	-.43	.11	-.12	.00	.37	-.01	.04
	Female	.17	.16	-.21	.57	.39	.13	.05	-.35	.54	.04	-.33	-.08
Jacqulyn	Male	.26	-.04	-.05	.27	-.16	.02	-.06	-.03	-.28	-.07	.10	.02
	Female	.16	-.39	.17	-.08	.07	-.37	.01	.06	-.16	-.30	.14	-.03
Arthur	Male	-.07	.24	.20	.15	.18	.45	-.10	-.18	-.41	-.01	.31	.83
	Female	.19	.41	.44	-.28	-.12	-.02	.14	-.28	-.39	-.18	.51	-.04
Michael	Male	-.18	.19	.17	.30	.02	.13	-.28	-.28	.29	-.03	-.15	.05
	Female	.14	.08	-.06	.45	.75	.35	.00	-.39	-.31	.28	.55	-.23
Robert M.	Male	.11	-.22	-.19	-.12	.27	-.13	-.60	.34	-.02	.02	-.11	.10
	Female	.08	-.15	-.27	.22	.54	.09	-.03	.21	.27	.22	.14	-.18
Harvey	Male	.20	.09	.33	.12	.07	.42	-.01	-.17	-.04	-.15	.10	-.47
	Female	.23	.32	.43	-.04	-.49	-.17	-.10	-.30	-.03	-.40	-.08	-.30
Janet	Male	.10	.05	.00	.13	.32	-.39	-.15	-.11	-.24	-.05	-.30	-.12
	Female	-.19	.12	.11	.16	-.20	-.38	-.42	-.17	.22	-.36	-.08	-.41
Deena	Male	-.19	-.02	-.08	.23	-.21	-.12	-.04	.03	-.30	.18	-.11	.36
	Female	-.51	.10	-.07	-.44	.14	.13	.34	.48	-.56	-.05	-.09	*
							Fall 1969						
LuAnn	Male	-.30	.04	-.17	.03	-.11	-.12	-.11	.21	.07	.02	-.26	-.43
	Female	-.21	-.12	-.15	-.29	.20	-.24	.28	.14	-.14	.29	.09	.10
Severine	Male	-.24	.51	.22	.41	.26	.00	.30	-.01	-.26	.08	-.04	-.07
	Female	.08	-.06	-.04	.17	.20	.26	-.01	.00	-.05	.00	.42	-.16
Jack	Male	.16	.01	.01	-.20	-.38	.52	-.53	-.25	.51	-.09	-.06	.28
	Female	.13	.13	.13	.06	.01	.04	.08	-.07	.22	-.07	-.09	-.24
Robert A.	Male	-.38	.48	.35	.38	-.17	-.07	-.05	-.16	-.04	-.12	.21	-.24
	Female	.00	.05	-.01	-.25	-.05	-.22	.02	.21	-.27	.01	-.10	-.24
Leslie	Male	-.47	.26	.40	.08	.08	.25	-.07	.20	.30	.07	-.09	.02
	Female	.03	-.12	-.15	-.14	-.31	.14	-.20	-.11	-.03	-.04	-.13	-.26
Kay	Male	.43	-.04	-.29	.06	.14	.29	.00	-.16	.09	-.47	-.05	-.49
	Female	-.05	.01	-.06	-.38	-.28	-.22	-.10	-.17	-.35	-.04	-.09	-.54
Violet	Male	.47	.40	.43	-.09	.08	.48	-.08	-.37	-.07	-.58	.34	.24
	Female	-.04	.08	-.05	-.09	.06	-.15	-.12	.09	-.17	.22	.07	-.09
Anthony	Male	-.10	-.27	-.15	.00	.16	.10	-.47	.00	-.19	.37	.16	.11
	Female	.32	-.01	-.10	.21	-.03	.14	-.25	-.31	.06	-.34	.29	-.46
Andrew	Male	.04	-.20	-.22	.17	.15	.39	-.17	.04	-.06	.02	.16	-.39
	Female	.10	-.14	.07	.17	-.05	-.05	.27	.06	.24	-.12	-.20	-.09
Antonia	Male	.42	.15	.08	.19	-.25	-.16	-.28	.02	.14	-.08	.16	-.21
	Female	.00	.08	-.10	.02	-.16	-.02	-.19	-.22	-.02	.13	-.04	.04
Robert M.	Male	.47	.26	.26	-.04	-.31	-.33	.25	-.04	.03	-.21	-.02	.03
	Female	-.07	-.04	-.07	-.20	-.02	-.23	.07	.04	.03	-.23	-.14	-.28
Janet	Male	.23	.14	.23	.09	-.33	.36	-.55	-.41	-.23	-.55	.13	.21
	Female	.27	-.15	-.21	-.11	.04	-.12	.02	-.01	-.12	-.18	-.03	.27

* N less than 10, no gamma computed.

Table 14

Sex of Student by Course Evaluation
(gamma)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Spring 1968	.04	.02	.00	.12	-.15	-.09	.04	-.02	-.02	.01	.02	.13	-.00
Fall 1968	-.07	.04	-.05	.05	.12	-.03	.01	.08	.10	.02	-.13	-.00	.08
Spring 1969	.00	-.04	-.09	.08	.13	-.15	.06	.05	.08	.14	-.04	.07	-.04
Fall 1969	-.05	-.04	-.13	.07	.17	-.10	-.02	.08	.16	.07	-.08	.06	.09

Table 15

Sex of Student by Course Evaluation Controlled
for Number of Semesters in College
(gamma)

Semesters in College	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
						Spring 1968							
1	-.08	-.03	.00	-.23	-.03	-.03	-.06	.01	-.27	.13	-.05	.31	-.15
2	-.04	.06	.12	.21	-.08	.05	-.22	-.04	-.13	-.20	.05	.06	-.20
3	-.18	-.11	-.17	-.21	.33	-.26	.31	.24	-.24	.42	-.10	.37	.01
4 or more	.06	.09	.01	.16	.05	.04	.07	.07	-.22	-.04	.01	.33	-.10
						Fall 1968							
1	.19	.01	.05	.24	.09	.20	-.08	-.28	.20	.07	.00	.18	-.17
2	.28	.21	-.11	.15	-.33	-.02	-.04	-.19	-.32	-.18	.13	.08	-.27
3	.15	-.19	-.01	.25	-.12	.22	-.20	-.24	.18	.19	-.01	.18	-.24
4 or more	-.24	-.22	-.10	.08	-.16	-.21	-.18	.19	.00	.02	-.19	.07	-.21
						Spring 1969							
1	.01	-.09	-.13	-.52	.09	.01	-.24	.07	-.17	-.17	-.06	.25	-.13
2	.03	-.08	-.05	-.13	.07	-.04	.20	-.03	-.17	.22	-.09	.20	-.02
3	-.28	-.25	-.56	-.14	.00	-.30	-.43	.25	-.23	.02	-.67	.25	-.10
4 or more	.30	.07	-.05	.00	.08	-.14	.04	-.08	-.01	.25	-.10	.20	-.06
						Fall 1969							
1	.20	.12	.09	-.05	-.17	.13	.04	-.22	-.02	.01	.12	.17	-.19
2	.34	.08	.22	-.29	-.28	.15	.12	-.40	.11	-.30	-.04	-.13	-.16
3	.14	-.08	-.13	.01	-.06	.07	.08	-.10	-.05	-.09	-.20	.26	-.03
4 or more	-.29	.11	.07	-.04	-.01	.03	.26	.18	-.20	.08	-.07	.06	.00

Table 16

Sex of Student by Course Evaluation Controlled for Tutor
(gamma)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
						Spring 1968							
Adrian	.00	.20	.19	.27	.02	-.20	-.24	-.28	-.18	-.14	.15	-.11	-.27
Samuel	.13	-.11	-.13	.11	.19	-.12	.06	.19	-.07	.18	.08	.36	-.53
Gerhard	-.05	.27	.07	.13	.10	-.08	.12	.17	-.30	-.28	.19	.23	-.07
Charlotte	-.14	.22	.26	.06	-.03	-.09	.04	-.15	-.25	-.37	.05	.11	-.06
Arthur	.04	-.25	-.16	-.20	-.09	.00	-.00	.05	-.16	.11	.01	.33	.03
William	-.12	.17	.28	.26	-.13	.44	-.25	.01	.03	.04	.20	-.02	-.28
Roberta	-.24	-.08	-.38	.18	-.07	.11	.11	.37	-.24	-.30	-.27	.34	.06
Paula	.20	.27	.40	.25	-.30	.38	.11	-.28	-.14	.14	-.02	-.04	-.25
Linda	-.03	-.12	-.21	-.16	.07	-.23	-.16	.13	-.10	-.00	-.19	.26	-.32
James	.00	-.25	-.31	.10	.32	-.32	-.43	.09	-.42	.18	-.24	.48	.04
						Fall 1968							
Delores	.44	-.18	-.21	.01	-.18	.40	-.07	-.37	.38	.01	-.43	.25	-.43
Adrian	.34	-.27	-.00	.23	-.39	.10	.06	-.31	.05	.09	-.13	.30	-.21
Lee	-.05	-.16	-.12	.51	-.18	.23	-.14	-.37	-.06	.10	.13	-.01	-.12
Pamela	.05	-.21	-.22	.35	-.10	-.09	-.24	-.06	.38	.09	-.32	.11	-.19
Robert A.	.40	.42	.37	.24	-.21	.26	-.28	-.48	.24	-.40	.35	.02	-.40
Gerhard	.05	-.20	-.02	.24	-.03	.44	-.45	-.38	-.15	-.14	.14	.05	-.11
Arthur	.00	-.03	.40	.24	-.30	.26	-.20	-.18	.52	.39	.25	.11	-.33
Michael	.27	.08	.17	.17	.01	.16	.10	.05	-.19	.04	.16	.22	-.24
Robert M.	.41	-.17	.26	.02	-.14	.00	-.12	-.33	.34	-.13	.18	.10	-.21
Harvey	-.11	.01	-.32	.09	.61	-.40	.13	-.21	-.19	.61	-.18	.49	-.08
Janet	.05	.10	.24	.33	-.25	.31	-.40	-.35	.16	.16	.02	.55	-.19

Table 16 (con't)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
						Spring 1969							
Delores	-.32	.31	.02	-.17	.16	-.20	-.05	-.18	.24	.33	.00	.08	.04
Lee	-.11	.20	.37	-.33	-.00	-.02	.13	-.12	.05	-.33	-.08	.30	.06
Pamela	.09	-.16	-.24	-.10	.32	-.15	-.10	.06	-.15	-.08	-.12	.44	.14
Robert A.	-.10	-.23	-.06	-.39	.02	-.35	.25	.46	.07	.21	-.39	.35	-.23
Jacqulyn	.19	-.25	-.02	.03	.17	-.07	-.27	-.02	-.16	.15	-.12	.14	-.07
Arthur	.40	.03	-.03	.15	-.01	-.12	-.26	-.54	-.22	.30	.19	.11	.00
Michael	.10	-.16	-.42	-.34	-.14	.07	.07	.13	-.35	.22	-.48	.52	.00
Robert M.	-.04	-.50	-.51	-.05	-.12	-.52	-.16	.54	-.19	.59	.17	.36	-.14
Harvey	.26	.11	.08	-.22	.29	-.03	.06	.25	-.21	.20	-.23	.11	-.01
Janet	.05	.01	-.07	.17	.35	-.34	.13	-.01	-.12	.11	-.17	-.01	-.17
Deena	-.14	.08	-.40	-.32	-.51	.45	.15	-.14	-.13	.33	-.25	.05	-.28
						Fall 1969							
LuAnn	.27	-.01	.06	-.11	-.30	.00	.03	-.15	.19	.29	.20	.12	.06
Severine	.11	.32	.24	-.09	-.25	-.06	.23	.21	-.22	-.42	-.12	.53	-.45
Jack	.09	.07	.12	-.04	-.22	.15	.24	-.35	-.19	-.28	.32	-.32	.22
Robert A.	.18	-.43	-.34	-.16	.07	-.13	.17	.07	-.07	.21	-.40	.28	-.08
Leslie	-.12	.24	.33	-.30	.16	-.02	.00	-.33	-.26	-.35	.15	.09	-.39
Kay	.38	.18	.17	.07	-.06	.32	.12	-.56	.08	.12	.17	.14	.03
Violet	.46	.39	.40	.08	-.26	.36	-.10	-.38	-.31	-.31	.01	-.03	-.23
Anthony	.15	-.23	-.12	-.02	-.61	.36	-.02	-.33	-.13	-.14	-.27	.23	-.29
Andrew	.17	.09	.00	-.10	-.29	.30	.12	-.29	-.20	.20	-.10	.35	-.27
Antonia	.06	-.03	-.10	-.26	-.43	.13	-.08	-.36	.02	-.27	-.11	.03	-.32
Robert M.	.05	.07	.17	-.17	.09	.41	.25	.03	.03	.31	.01	.26	-.04
Janet	.03	-.23	-.19	.00	-.03	-.30	.26	.39	-.09	.08	-.00	.38	-.26

Table 17

Number of Semesters in College by Course Evaluation
(gamma)

Semesters in College	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
						Spring 1968						
	.08	.00	.04	.09	.01	-.03	.00	.00	.01	-.04	.09	.24
						Fall 1968						
	-.02	.01	-.08	.10	.09	-.10	-.00	.03	.12	.06	-.15	.07
						Spring 1969						
	.12	-.03	-.04	.06	.15	-.07	.03	-.03	.20	.16	-.02	.07
						Fall 1969						
	-.01	-.05	-.10	-.02	.15	-.15	-.00	.02	.16	.10	-.11	.05

Table 18

Number of Semesters in College by Course Evaluation Controlled for Sex of Student (gamma)

Sex	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
						Spring 1968							
Male	.00	.00	.03	.08	.09	-.09	-.10	.00	-.01	-.00	.02	.08	-.04
Female	.09	.04	-.02	.16	.21	-.09	.08	.08	-.03	.03	.02	.19	.02
						Fall 1968							
Male	-.01	.12	.03	.07	.20	.06	.05	.01	.07	-.01	-.10	.02	.09
Female	-.07	-.03	-.08	.11	.03	-.05	-.03	.07	.14	.07	-.16	.03	.02
						Spring 1969							
Male	-.07	-.09	-.11	-.02	.13	-.10	.05	.07	.02	.09	-.02	.10	-.05
Female	.09	.00	-.08	.21	.15	-.21	.08	.01	.13	.23	-.07	.06	-.04
						Fall 1969							
Male	.05	.03	-.07	.09	.08	.00	-.07	-.01	.17	.05	.06	.13	-.00
Female	-.06	-.07	-.15	.03	.17	-.14	.03	.07	.14	.06	-.18	.07	.12

Table 19

Number of Semesters in College by Course Evaluation Controlled for Tutor (gamma)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
						Spring 1968						
Adrian	-.09	.06	.12	.15	-.03	-.07	.17	.14	.02	-.01	.03	.22
Samuel	.19	.13	.19	-.17	.23	.08	-.17	-.04	-.01	-.09	.46	.03
Gerhard	.03	-.11	-.09	.17	.01	.00	-.22	.16	-.10	.18	.04	.05
Charlotte	.13	.31	.41	.31	-.26	.11	-.27	-.16	.11	-.27	.28	.22
Arthur	-.28	-.29	-.16	.06	.13	-.16	.28	.41	.01	.00	.11	.67
William	.06	-.36	-.17	.01	.33	-.19	-.03	-.12	-.21	.18	-.17	.33
Roberta	.24	-.01	-.06	.03	-.28	.00	-.17	-.02	.25	.05	.03	.20
Paula	-.06	-.06	-.04	-.00	.23	-.23	.02	.01	-.04	-.44	.19	.34
Linda	.40	.26	.35	.30	-.25	.21	.64	-.22	.32	-.18	.18	-.30
James	.06	.19	-.06	-.10	.19	-.20	.11	-.10	-.18	.03	.04	.60
						Fall 1968						
Delores	-.05	-.15	-.03	-.03	.12	-.15	.18	.19	.46	-.06	-.18	.15
Adrian	-.11	.22	-.02	.02	.22	.03	-.12	.08	.15	-.06	.02	-.05
Lee	.04	-.24	-.46	-.07	-.22	.04	.27	.12	.33	-.08	-.29	.07
Pamela	.07	.20	-.06	.13	-.02	-.03	.06	.08	.10	-.09	-.14	-.17
Robert A.	-.08	-.12	-.11	.11	-.05	-.24	-.02	.07	.16	.12	-.24	-.04
Gerhard	.04	-.04	-.09	.40	.10	-.05	-.07	-.01	-.01	.12	-.24	.15
Arthur	.00	.04	-.20	-.12	.05	-.06	-.24	.09	.03	.14	-.34	-.09
Michael	-.13	-.13	-.06	.25	.41	-.04	.01	.01	.30	.03	-.18	.55
Robert M.	-.23	.24	-.05	-.20	.03	.01	.08	.12	-.31	.17	-.18	-.12
Harvey	.40	-.19	-.09	.19	.19	.24	-.02	-.24	-.03	.14	-.12	.04
Janet	-.00	.24	.17	.26	.12	-.04	-.19	-.08	-.01	.17	.21	.15

Table 19 (con't)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
						Spring 1969						
Delores	-.17	.31	.27	-.25	.13	.54	.09	.38	.40	.08	.14	-.27
Lee	.30	-.11	.19	.09	.01	.21	.14	-.33	.34	.14	.03	.07
Pamela	.07	-.02	-.09	-.10	.27	-.41	-.01	.01	-.15	.25	.37	.41
Robert A.	.35	-.13	.12	.36	.07	-.57	-.17	-.47	-.12	.27	-.14	-.24
Jacqulyn	-.15	.23	.09	.43	.23	.30	.18	.16	-.09	.03	-.44	.28
Arthur	.15	-.52	-.51	-.06	.27	-.52	.18	.23	.21	.18	-.14	-.10
Michael	.13	.19	-.07	.02	-.20	.23	-.14	.17	.56	.20	.24	.12
Robert M.	-.04	.08	.05	-.24	-.04	.00	-.44	-.59	.53	.20	-.06	-.20
Harvey	.30	.49	.14	.21	.03	.34	.02	.08	.18	-.05	-.02	.00
Janet	.36	-.32	-.31	.08	.35	-.62	.01	-.19	.38	.60	-.25	.25
Deena	-.40	-.34	-.11	-.02	-.25	-.05	.38	.08	.00	.56	-.02	.82
						Fall 1969						
LuAnn	-.23	-.01	-.16	.12	.20	-.05	.01	.10	.04	-.03	-.57	-.13
Severine	.16	.01	-.08	-.32	.43	-.21	.26	.03	.00	.35	-.12	.02
Jack	-.03	-.25	-.27	-.45	-.08	-.36	.08	-.01	-.45	.14	-.15	-.21
Robert A.	.44	-.10	-.13	-.06	-.17	-.49	-.36	-.22	.41	.28	.17	.00
Leslie	-.07	.03	.16	.08	.30	-.21	-.19	.10	.10	.26	.06	.02
Kay	-.56	.14	-.04	.09	.30	-.17	-.22	.39	-.06	-.08	-.29	.18
Violet	-.01	.05	-.33	.23	.46	-.61	-.32	.11	.48	-.27	-.34	.15
Anthony	-.10	-.00	.09	.28	.36	-.16	-.06	.30	-.08	-.10	.13	.05
Andrew	-.16	-.08	.03	-.10	.15	-.10	.21	.09	.17	.05	-.12	.03
Antonia	.13	-.08	-.20	.20	.34	.08	.30	-.08	.30	.29	-.10	.13
Robert M.	.13	.36	.26	-.02	.05	.55	-.11	-.27	.36	.10	.18	.08
Janet	.21	-.49	-.43	-.13	.04	-.23	.03	-.16	.34	.04	-.11	.15

Table 20

Number of Semesters in College by Course Evaluation
Controlled for Tutor and Sex of Student
(gamma)

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
							Spring 1968						
Adrian	Male	.21	.40	.67	.09	-.21	-.73	-.03	.21	-.26	.22	.47	-.02
	Female	-.15	-.05	-.17	.23	.03	.17	.21	.04	.26	-.16	-.09	.32
Samuel	Male	.13	-.23	.48	.06	.07	.06	-.46	-.75	.23	.13	1.00	.13
	Female	.32	.43	.00	-.41	.43	.10	.10	.35	-.33	-.38	.14	-.10
Gerhard	Male	.48	-.34	-.29	.13	.00	-.09	-.09	.21	-.05	-.40	-.21	-.52
	Female	-.35	.10	.02	.26	.10	.04	-.32	.30	-.23	.58	.27	.65
Charlotte	Male	.16	.49	.68	.08	-.36	.35	-.17	-.16	.16	-.20	.46	.17
	Female	.14	.02	-.03	.85	-.02	-.44	-.52	-.06	.04	-.43	-.04	.36
Arthur	Male	-.56	.26	.20	.18	.01	.26	.21	.63	-.65	-.03	.23	.88
	Female	-.04	-.56	-.32	-.03	.23	-.47	.31	.27	.44	.02	.04	.35
William	Male	-.26	-.23	-.11	-.05	.34	-.17	.02	-.03	-.49	.22	-.08	.67
	Female	.73	-.58	-.33	.11	.33	-.23	-.10	-.26	.17	.14	-.33	-.32
Roberta	Male	.46	-.11	-.09	.09	-.40	.01	-.09	-.13	.13	-.03	.20	.36
	Female	-.11	.13	-.05	-.02	-.13	-.01	-.32	.12	.44	.16	-.26	.02
Paula	Male	-.11	-.13	-.34	-.16	.30	-.16	.00	.12	-.10	-.33	-.10	.62
	Female	.14	.25	.80	.50	-.67	-.23	.09	-.45	.00	1.00	1.00	-.33
Linda	Male	.58	.29	-.13	.58	-.33	.00	.14	-.33	1.00	-.13	-.31	-.09
	Female	.29	.27	.59	.19	-.16	.34	.96	-.20	.09	-.08	.54	-.32
James	Male	-.06	.00	-.52	-.15	.09	-.33	.03	.05	-.21	-.19	-.30	.64
	Female	.35	.67	.92	.00	.30	.00	.32	-.32	.00	.32	.87	.56
							Fall 1968						
Delores	Male	.64	.28	.45	.24	-.08	-.14	.40	-.06	.39	-.33	.32	.27
	Female	-.26	-.29	-.21	-.13	.22	-.15	.10	.28	.51	.06	-.39	.22
Adrian	Male	-.32	.29	-.13	-.17	-.01	-.30	-.08	.20	.09	.04	.24	.02
	Female	.51	.15	.16	.49	.00	.48	-.19	-.47	.26	-.20	-.17	.04
Lee	Male	-.08	-.07	-.38	-.31	.21	-.25	.31	.30	.55	-.00	-.22	-.35
	Female	.16	-.46	-.58	.08	-.56	.23	.25	-.04	.14	-.15	-.32	.42
Pamela	Male	.56	-.19	-.44	.57	.36	-.61	-.37	.00	.50	-.14	-.17	-.16
	Female	-.07	.33	.08	.00	-.13	.15	.19	.07	-.06	-.08	-.12	-.17
Robert A.	Male	.02	.11	.25	.22	-.08	-.38	.06	.00	.35	-.84	.08	-.38
	Female	-.01	.05	-.08	.10	-.06	-.14	-.16	-.07	.19	.39	-.20	.12
Gerhard	Male	-.29	.21	.02	-.06	.48	.06	.57	.14	.09	.71	-.22	.48
	Female	.18	-.13	-.13	.49	-.05	-.10	-.23	-.08	-.03	-.06	-.24	.02
Arthur	Male	.19	.30	-.23	.06	-.14	.17	-.22	.11	-.28	-.46	-.33	.28
	Female	-.07	-.07	-.15	-.15	.08	-.23	-.31	.07	.44	.50	-.33	-.28
Michael	Male	-.03	-.06	.03	.10	.51	.13	-.03	-.22	.42	.30	-.32	.75
	Female	.18	-.15	-.05	.36	.36	-.13	.02	.07	.23	-.10	-.08	.52
Robert M.	Male	-.28	.40	.23	-.31	.04	.26	.10	-.31	.26	.10	-.30	.00
	Female	-.08	.11	-.11	-.09	-.02	-.07	.01	.18	-.55	.18	-.11	.00
Harvey	Male	.56	-.22	-.34	.47	.71	.42	-.09	-.07	-.41	-.03	-.25	.06
	Female	.32	-.17	-.02	.04	.01	.12	.03	-.32	.19	.31	-.09	-.01
Janet	Male	.36	.29	.42	.23	-.08	.15	-.19	-.46	-.02	.08	.14	.54
	Female	-.27	.28	.06	.32	.23	-.11	-.27	.13	-.13	.24	.25	.06

Table 20 (con't)

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
							Spring 1969						
Delores	Male	-.13	.31	.21	-.12	.32	.48	.11	.24	.26	.10	.17	-.01
	Female	-.47	.29	.57	1.00	-.83	.83	.00	1.00	1.00	.00	.00	1.00
Lee	Male	.40	.10	.54	-.20	.11	.49	.06	-.28	.34	-.08	.01	.57
	Female	.17	-.50	-.46	1.00	-.27	-.32	.37	-.52	.33	.84	.11	-.60
Pamela	Male	-.12	.05	.10	-.17	.31	-.41	-.28	.13	-.10	.19	.58	.37
	Female	.58	-.06	-.31	.07	.13	-.42	.75	-.25	-.23	.51	.06	.29
Robert A.	Male	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
	Female	.24	-.33	-.33	.68	.14	-.47	-.22	-.31	.35	.33	-.59	*
Jacqulyn	Male	-.07	.13	-.05	-.05	-.22	.43	.26	.28	.57	-.33	-.88	.09
	Female	-.26	.35	.18	.67	.40	.26	.15	.11	-.34	.18	-.30	.36
Arthur	Male	.28	-.74	-.93	-.41	.58	-.58	-.77	.43	-.27	.00	.82	.00
	Female	.13	-.45	-.41	.05	.17	-.56	.49	.18	.34	.22	-.41	-.16
Michael	Male	.24	.17	-.21	-.08	-.02	-.14	.39	.11	.47	.61	.41	-.29
	Female	.00	.20	.03	.12	-.37	.30	-.51	.24	.73	-.13	.11	.57
Robert M.	Male	.18	-.48	-.60	-.45	-.38	.50	.40	-.81	.16	.82	.00	.18
	Female	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Harvey	Male	.38	.53	.29	.01	-.18	.69	.04	-.04	.09	-.10	.16	-.01
	Female	.27	.52	.23	.69	.47	.05	-.21	.00	.11	.12	.00	.00
Janet	Male	.88	-.42	-.64	.50	.39	-.90	.35	-.52	.55	.72	-.45	.00
	Female	-.01	-.25	-.13	-.11	.33	-.45	-.19	.00	.33	.50	-.12	.35
Deena	Male	-.70	-.15	.04	-.05	-.14	-.37	-.04	.10	-.03	.89	.27	.50
	Female	.00	-.65	-.47	.00	-.75	1.00	1.00	.00	-.24	.00	-.65	*
							Fall 1969						
LuAnn	Male	-.14	.40	.25	.53	-.10	-.26	-.56	-.16	.22	-.30	-.29	-.34
	Female	-.15	-.66	-.60	-.61	.34	.21	.48	.25	-.54	.68	-.82	.27
Severine	Male	.22	-.09	-.04	-.62	.35	-.16	.45	.04	.00	.83	.35	.16
	Female	.16	.07	-.06	-.20	.43	-.26	.24	.03	-.01	.12	-.35	-.04
Jack	Male	.04	-.31	-.18	-.16	-.07	-.57	-.06	-.08	-.44	-.25	.02	.00
	Female	-.11	-.15	-.25	-1.00	-.21	-.19	.41	-.24	-.50	.35	-.11	-.23
Robert A.	Male	.32	.13	.64	-.08	-.70	-.37	-.75	-.86	.00	.09	.58	.00
	Female	.55	-.38	-.45	-.13	.06	-.61	-.25	.03	.57	.36	-.09	.10
Leslie	Male	.11	.05	.22	.63	.68	.20	-.79	.03	-.56	1.00	.67	.00
	Female	-.12	.02	.15	-.09	.22	-.32	-.03	.13	.26	.11	-.11	.03
Kay	Male	-.35	.39	-.02	-.27	.33	-.09	.07	.54	.27	.16	-.16	.20
	Female	-.67	-.07	.02	.67	.16	.00	-.57	-.44	.01	-.39	-.47	.29
Violet	Male	.16	.14	-.44	.14	-.08	-.33	-.25	.50	.47	-.26	-.33	.60
	Female	.20	.19	-.23	.29	.62	-.66	-.40	-.24	.40	-.43	-.35	.05
Anthony	Male	-.40	-.42	.18	.10	.49	-.25	-.14	.38	-.10	.27	.07	.71
	Female	.15	.06	.03	.34	.17	.02	-.07	.12	-.16	-.32	.00	-.12
Andrew	Male	.40	-.59	-.22	-.25	.10	.16	.46	.00	.53	-.16	-.08	.24
	Female	-.34	.07	.13	-.04	.19	-.25	.14	.13	.01	.12	-.14	-.09
Antonia	Male	-.28	-.22	.05	.22	.19	.33	.36	-.11	-.27	.70	.23	-.20
	Female	.35	-.00	-.34	.10	.47	-.10	.26	-.07	.55	.04	-.33	.36
Robert M.	Male	.25	.64	.16	-.32	-.35	.57	.10	-.23	.00	.28	-.05	.51
	Female	-.08	.26	.36	.12	.26	.61	-.17	-.30	.48	.07	.32	-.14
Janet	Male	.43	-.40	-.35	1.00	.11	-.32	.17	-.37	.70	.15	-.01	.45
	Female	.10	-.53	-.45	.06	.02	-.17	-.05	-.13	.18	-.01	-.13	-.10

*n less than 10, no gamma.